IMPRIMATUR:

HAving perused the following Advices, I conceive them suitable and convenient for the use of the Persons concerned respectively: And I do accordingly Recommend them to the use of such Young Students in the *University* as design the *Study of Divinity*, or the *Susception of Holy Orders*; And to all others that shall desire to engage themselves in that *Holy Function*. And that they may be Communicated with more advantage, I do hereby *License* them to be *Printed* and *Published*,

Ja. Armachanus.

Two Letters OF ADVICE,

I. For the Susception of HOLY ORDERS.

II. For STUDIES THEOLOGICAL, especially such as are *Rational.*

At the end of the former, is inserted, a *Catalogue* of the *Christian Writers* and *Genuine Works* that are extant of the *First Three Centuries.*

The *Third Edition Corrected* and *Improved.* Together with the *Appendix* to the *Second Letter*, Concerning *Sanchoniathon's Phœnician History.*

By *Henry Dodwell*, M. A. and sometimes Fellow of *Trinity Colledge* near *Dublin* in *Ireland.*

Τῶν ἀκτίνων αὐτῶν καθαρωτέραν τῇ ΙΕΡΕΙ ἢ ψυχῇ εἶναι δεῖ ἵνα μή ποτε ἔρημον αὐτὸν καταλιμπάνῃ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. S. *Chrysost.* de Sacerdot. L. VI.

LONDON, Printed for *B. Tooke*, and are to be Sold by *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishop's-Head* in St. *Paul's-Church-yard*, 1691.

Two Letters
OF
ADVICE,

I. For the Subscription of HOLY ORDERS.

II. For STUDIES THEOLOGICAL, especially such as are Rational.

At the end of the former, is inserted a Catalogue of the Christian Ancient and Genuine Works that are extant of the First Five Centuries.

The Third Edition Corrected and Improved. Together with the Appendix to the Second Letter, Concerning Sandcroft's Pleonexia Hypocrisis.

To the Most Reverend Father in God

JAMES,

By *Divine Providence*, Lord Arch-bishop of

ARMAGH,

Primate and Metropolitane of all

IRELAND,

And Vice-Chancellor of the

UNIVERSITY

OF

DUBLIN.

My Lord,

YOU are so many ways Entitled to the *Patronage* of the ensuing *Advices*, as I do not know how I could be just in omitting this occasion of a publick acknowledgment of it. If the *Subject* be considered as relating either to *Conscience* or *Learning*, you have

a right of judging all concernments of either kind; the former as *Metropolitane*, and consequently as the *Supreme Guide of Conscience* under God in the Church of *Ireland*; the later as *Vice-Chancellor* of our *University*, in which regard you are most justly interessed in the *Fruits* and *Seeds* of your own cultivation. If the *Persons concerned*, they are all of them such as depend on your *direction*, and therefore the Rules for whose behaviour ought most properly to be communicated to them by your *recommendation*. If *my self*, as you have upon all occasions given evidences of your favour to me, so more signally in this affair, by first *advising* this publication, and after honouring it with your own *License* and *Approbation*. However *presumptuous* the attempt might seem, in other regards, yet to a Judge so *candid* and *favourable*, as I have always found

your

your *Grace* to be, the *innocence* and *ſincerity* of my deſign, for reſtoring *Chriſtianity* to her primitive ſplendor, may ſuffice to *excuſe*, if not *expiate*, appendent imprudences. For your *Grace* already underſtands too well to be informed by me, how vain it is to attempt a *Reformation* of the *Laity*, whilſt the *Clergy* is not held in that *Reputation* by them which might provoke them to an imitation of their example; and how little hopes there are of retriving that *Reputation* without a *Reformation* of their *Lives* and a *reſtitution* of their *Diſcipline*, which would prove the moſt expedient means to let ſuch perſons, who either *cannot*, or *will not*, diſtinguiſh betwixt the *Sacredneſs* of their *Office* and their *perſonal demerits*, underſtand the unexpreſſible uſefulneſs of their Calling, being piouſly and conſcientiouſly diſcharged, in order to the

most momentous and most noble ends of mankind. And that a *preconsideration* must needs prove more successful in promoting this industry in practice, which would, by way of obvious consequence, restore their honour, than any *postnate* advices, as being likely to *prevent* the *engagement* or *admission* of such persons who would not afterwards be capable of such impressions; and that it is more *secure* for the persons concerned to let them understand the *personal* and *habitual qualifications* necessary for rendring their duty performable by them, than *afterwards* to admonish them concerning *particulars*, when it is too late to retire, how unsuitable soever the practice prove to their *personal qualifications*, will not, I think, be doubted by any intelligent considerative person. This is my design in the *former* of the subsequent Letters, the use-

usefulness and convenience whereof is further cleared in the Letter it self, and has not, that I know of, been attempted by any other. If it had, I should very willingly have spared my own pains. My manner of performance also has been at once to shew the Advices *rational*, and to have been *designed by our Church*, that so it might be fitted for all sorts of concerned Readers, both such as are *able* to judge it themselves, and such as are *not*. I have therefore ordered the whole in such a *series* of discourse as that the *sequel* must needs be admitted by him who has granted the *Principles* lay'd down at the beginning; and the *first principle* is that which the *Church* her self first enquires into, even a *Providential Call from God*, or a *motion of the Spirit*, as far as that may be credited without danger of *Enthusiasm*. And accordingly the inferences have generally

nerally been exemplified in such instances as have been approved by our *Church* since her *reformation*, that so I might, as well as I was able, prevent objections, against my design from the *inconsiderableness of my person*, an artifice too usually, as it is weakly and unreasonably, made use of for the defeating the most commendable projects. The Objection in it self is in truth so very little momentous as that I should not think it worthy to be taken notice of, if I were not more solicitous for my *cause* than my *person*. But seeing it is so *obvious* in the way of persons that may be concerned to cross my design, and withal so *taking with the vulgar*, I doubt it will concern me, even *in prudence*, to crave your *Graces patience* for a *brief Apology*. Omitting therefore my own *justification*, which I confess a task too great for my weak abilities (though if I did under-

undertake it on a publick account, I might for an excuse of such immodesty, urge the example of the *great Apostle*, who, out of *tenderness* for his *cause*, was (as himself confesses) necessitated to such a *folly*) yet I conceive it undeniable, that the *merit* of the *cause* is abundantly sufficient to compensate the *demerit* of my *person*; and for my part, so that the cause may not be prejudiced, I shall very heartily submit the choice of *Instruments* to the pleasure of God himself. Besides further that it is extreamly unreasonable to urge *personal demerits* against a *cause*. Indeed if the cause had been recommended on *personal regards*, the disparagement of the *person* might have *invalidated* such a *recommendation*. But considering that nothing here is pretended, but the *solidity of the reasons* submitted to an *impartial* examination, none can say that they are the

weaker,

weaker for being propounded by an unworthy person. Neither indeed is the supposal true, that even in point of *Authority* any thing here is recommended only by my *private person.* For having shewn it in every particular *approved* and *designed* by the *Church*, it must needs be supported by her *Authority*, which may well be presumed sufficient for the design intended, the *general reformation of her Clergy.* But I must thankfully acknowledge that your *Grace* has in a great measure freed me from these personal *Odiums* by undertaking the *Patronage* of these otherwise despisable attempts. For none can now pretend themselves unconcerned in the *Advice* of a *Laick*, or a *private Person*, when the *supreme Metropolitane* has not only thought it *convenient*, but *recommended* it. This is the reason that necessitated me to take *Sanctuary* in your *Graces Patronage*,

age, wherein I dare more confidently promise my self a *kind reception* because you have encouraged it. Yet am I not herewith satisfied; but as *necessitous persons* are usually emboldened to *new requests* by *past concessions*; so, in order to the desired success of these Papers, I further beg a favour, greater and more efficacious than the greatest munificence of the most Potent *Temporal Princes*, though less *impoverishing*, and that is your *Fatherly Blessing* and *Prayers* for these and the other *Studies* and *Endeavours* of

Your Graces,

Most obliged

and obsequious Servant,

H. D.

A PREFACE TO THE READER.

THE CONTENTS.

THE tendency of the disrespect of the Clergy *to the contempt of* Religion, *and the* usefulness *of these Discourses for preventing that* disrespect, §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *Their* usefulness *for satisfying* Dissenters *in* Religion, §. 9, 10. *Their* Usefulness *for the* Laity *as well as the* Clergy, §. 11. *The* Use *of the Study of the* Publick Records *of the* Church, §. 12. *A Censure of the Modern* School-Divinity, §. 13. *Some Proposals for* Reforming *it*, §. 14, 15, 16, 17. *The* Usefulness *of such a* Reformation, *if attempted, for reuniting the* Divisions *of* Christendom, §. 18.

HOW much the Reputation of *Religion* is concerned in the honour of its *relatives* especially the *persons teaching* and *professing* it; as it has been the *sense* of all prudent *Nations*, so it is too evident from the *experience* of *ours*. For if we seriously reflect on that *Irreligion* and *Atheism* which has lately so over-run that part of the *Gentry* who have had that *Freedom of Education* as to discern beyond the *grosser Superstitions* of the *credulous vulgar*, and yet wanted that *depth* and *solidity* of *judgment*, or that *industry*

stry and *diligence*, which had been requisite for a *positive satisfaction*, concerning the *true measures* of things; I think there cannot be a more probable *Original* assigned for it, than this of the *Contempt of the Clergy*. And it is somewhat strange to consider how unlikely *Persons*, and how far from designing such *hurtful Consequences*, have yet been unawares engaged on them by having first, though on plausible pretences, imbibed *mischievous Principles*. For when upon pretence of a maintenance of their *Christian liberty*, some persons of a better *meaning* than *Information*, were seduced by their more subtilly-designing *Leaders* to resist some *indifferent Constitutions* of their *Superiors*; they found themselves obliged in pursuance of their Principles to call in *Question* their whole *Authority*. For considering that they were not any particular *abuses* of a *just Authority*, not any bare *inexpediency* in the *Ceremonies* already established (for which *Governours*, not *Subjects*, had been responsible, and for which a redress ought to have been desired by *Subjects* in a *modest* and *peaceable way*, which, if denyed, could not have justified a Separation, seeing that nothing under *sin* can excuse that, and a condescension to Superiors in *confessed inexpediencies* cannot be proved a *sin*) but the very *Authority* by which they had been established; and finding further that this Authority was of that kind that was indeed intrinsecally involved in all *exercise* of *Government*, so that it was impossible to plead any exception of *duty* upon supposal that their Superiors had transgressed the bounds of their *just power*; they perceived themselves reduced

reduced to this *extremity* to justifie their own *disobedience* by a *renunciation* of their *Authority*. For indeed all *Government* must needs prove useless that is denyed a *power* of *imposing temporary obligations*, and that power must needs be denyed, where all things necessary are supposed *antecedently determined*, and what is not so is thought uncapable of any *just determination*.

Having therefore thus devested the *Clergy* of all power properly so called, yet that they might seem to attribute something to the eminency of their place in the Church, they were willing to allow a power of *perswading* such as were willing to obey, only with this difference (that I can perceive) from the meerest *Laick*, that *Laicks* might *perswade* others to piety, but *Clergymen* must; that it was *Charity* in them, but *duty* in these; that it was only the *general Calling* of those, but the *particular* of these; that the *Laity* might discharge it *privately*, but the *publick performance* of it was only permitted to the *Clergy*. This seems to have been the uttermost design of their first Leaders, none of them, that I know of, ever enduring to hear of any *Laical* encroachments on the *Calling* it self. But whilst they were so Studious in *opposing* their *established Superiors*, and so careless of *better provisions* for that unsettlement themselves has introduced into the Church, or the ill consequences of their own attempts; they unawares undermined their own Foundations, and exposed themselves to the same encroachments from the *Laity*, which themselves had attempted on their *settled Governours*. For lest any *Veneration* of their *Calling* might ren- §. 2.

der their *persuasions* themselves so *awful*, as not to admit of any *easie contradiction*, which might still preserve some *Discipline* and *Dependence* of the *Laity* upon them; themselves had furnished the *Usurping Laity* with such pretences as must, by just Consequence, make that *reverence* it self prove very inconsiderable.

§. 3. For first, they had opposed professedly all difference betwixt the *Clergy* and *Laity*, and indeed all *relative Holiness*, as *Popish* and *Antichristian*, and tending to the Usurpation of a *Lordship over Gods Heritage*; so that now there was nothing left to the *Clergy* that might so much as challenge a respect of the *Laity*, but their personal skill in the *objects* of their *Profession*, which both left the *unskilful Clergy* destitute of any *pretence* of challenging reverence; and was no *curb* to the more *skilful Laity*; and indeed in the event made them *perfectly equal*, seeing that the *skilful Laity* might as well challenge respect from the *unkilful Clergy*, as the *skilful Clergy* from the *unskilful Laity*, their *order* being indeed no ingredient in the ground of such a challenge.

§. 4. Besides Secondly, their making the *Scriptures* an *Adæquate Rule* for all *prudential establishments*; and obliging the *Laity* to a *particular enquiry* into the *merit* of *Ecclesiastical Constitutions*, even in *probable*, as well as *certain*, *Senses* of the *Scripture*, not so much as advising a *modest acquiescency*, in the *judgment of the Clergy*, even in things they do *not understand*, nor indeed letting them understand their *incompetency* in any case where they might hope for the *assistance* of a more able guide (for indeed that pretence of understanding

ing the *Scripture* by its *internal light*, or by the *Spirit* whereby it was written, or by *prayer* without urging the use of *ordinary means*, the *methods* of expounding the Scriptures so celebrated among them, seem extreamly to favour *Enthusiasm*, and to *supersede* the *necessity* of an *exterior guide*) these pretences, I say, seem to deprive the *Clergy* of the *Authority* even of *proponents*, which is the least that can be imagined, and therefore of all respect on this regard, and therefore must needs degrade them to an *equality* with the *Laity*. In all which way of proceeding every later Sect argued *rationally* and *consequently* from the *Principles* of the *first Innovators*.

The *Laity* therefore having such specious §. 4.
consequent pretences for their *Independence* on the *Clergy*, and yet the *Clergy* still insisting on their *Original claim*; it was obvious to conceive with what *jealousie* and *partiality* their proceedings herein must be censured by the *Laity*, who now looked upon themselves as *Adversaries* concerned to maintain their *Liberty* against the *conceived Usurpations* of the *Clergy*. And finding the *Clergy* to be *interessed* in the *Controversies*, both as to the *honour* and *obedience* challenged by them, and as to that *affluence of temporal fruitions* which had been conferred on them by *devout persons* as suitable expressions of that *honour*; they did not make that use thereof, which in *reason* they ought, to enquire first, whether that *private interest* it self of the *Clergy*, were not coincident with the *publick* of the *Church*; or Secondly, whether it were not coincident with the *truth*. Whereof, if neither could appear

upon a sober scrutiny; but that the arguments for the contrary were found either *evident* or *more probable*; then indeed, and not till then, it might be presumed that *interest* might have an influence in their *determination*.

§. 6. But, as the *vulgar* is very willing to *censure*, and yet very *loth* to undergo the *trouble* of a *laborious enquiry*, so they have made the *Clergies interest* a *prejudice* against their *cause*; so that now their *arguments* are either not *heard* (they not being presumed *competent Advocates* for their *own cause*, and others not being concerned *for them*, as not being concerned *with them*) or if they be heard, yet with no *indifferency*, the *Interest* of the *Clergy* being thought inconsistent with that of the *Laity*. A way of proceeding not only very *unjust*, but very *unreasonable*, it being every way as *weak* to conclude a cause *false* as *true*, on no other pretence but that of *private interest*. However this argument, such as it is, being by *prophane Persons* taken for *granted* from the concessions of the *Religious Laity*; and they withal further discovering the *unreasonableness* of those Persons who, upon pretence of *honouring Religion*, had brought a *contempt* upon its *principal professors* and *defenders*; it was obvious for Persons so interessed against Religion, so intent on little Arts and Advantages, so little awed by Moral Conscience and Ingenuity, that might hinder them from shifts unequal and unbecoming them, and so willing withal to be excused from proving what, upon tryal, they would find so impossible to prove: I say, it was obvious for such to conclude Religion it self *dishonourable* and

suspicious

suspicious from this *ill Character* of its chiefest Champions. For if what makes for the *interest* of the *Clergy* must immediately be *condemned* or *suspected* without any further enquiry, which is the *unreasonable practice* of the *vulgar*; then the *prophane person* finding *Religion in general* conducive to this purpose, and being brought into *suspicious thoughts* of the Clergy by the pretended discoveries of the *greatest pretenders* to *Religion*; it is but natural to conceive what consequences he will be likely to deduce thence to the prejudice of *Religion in general.*

Nor was this a propable Consequence, only with the *designed Atheist*, but also with all such whose *averseness* to the severe Prescriptions of Religion, might make them desirous to be eased from its restraints, and therefore *favourable* to any thing that might look like an Argument to excuse them from its obligation. Under which number as we may contain the generality of the *ordinary Practices* of *Religion*; so are these Principles fitted for the debauching them, whether we consider their *designed Consequences*, or the *natural events* of things. For this *dishonour of the Clergy* was like to invalidate the use of all *coerceive means* for inducing the *Laity* to a *practice* of their *duty*, and so to leave them intirely to the influence of their own good natures. And when this came to pass, this would be the further event of it. Though at first they might be *heated* into a *Zeal* by way of *Antiperistasis* from the *opposition* of their *Adversaries*; yet upon their *dis-appearing*, that *zeal* which had only been inflamed by *æmulation*, must (like *Rome* §. 7.

 upon

upon the demolition of *Carthage*) decay, and so their former *licentiousness* will return with a *violence* proportionable to their former *restraint*. And when Men are come to this *extream*, they will then be as much concerned that those *threats* of the *Clergy* which awaken their *Consciences*, and make them *nauseate* and *disrelish* the *pleasures* of their *Sins*, should be *false*, at least should be *believed so by themselves* (which *belief* though *false*, may serve to *stupifie* their *present sense*) as they pretend the *Clergy interessed* in their *truth*, and therefore may be presumed as partial. And when Men are *willing* and *interessed* to *disbelieve Religion*, how very *weak reasons* are sufficient to induce them to it, themselves acknowledge when the case is not immediately applyed to themselves; there being no *disparity* to exempt *disbelief* from being as obnoxious to interest as that *credulity* so much decryed by them. Indeed any one that would consider the *Persons* that are Enemies to Religion, (that they are such *usually* as are not *seriously addicted*, and though *pretending* to be *wits*, yet not *deeply considerative*) or *the weakness of the reasons*, either tending to *direct Septicism*, or *undermining their own foundations*, or *arguing an unwillingness of conviction*, would suspect this to have been the *gradation* of their *disbelief*.

§. 8. As it has therefore thus appeared, both from *reason*, and *experience*, that this *contempt of the Clergy* does naturally tend to *Atheism* and *Irreligion*; so on the contrary the best prevention of these horrid consequences will be their restitution to their due *respect* and *honour*; which will best be performed by a *præmonition* of persons *designing*

signing this Calling, that they may neither *engage* in what they are not able to *perform*, nor *endeavor a reformation* of inconveniencies when it is *too late*. This is the design of these Papers, which I hope all they who ground their hopes of *present* or *future prosperity* on their love of our *Jerusalem*, will conceive themselves obliged to further by their *prayers* or *powers* as God shall enable them.

But besides this first use which is very suitable to the *necessities* of this *present age*, there is also another of no small moment, the *satisfaction of our well meaning separating Brethren*. For whatever other *weak reasons* are pretended (as indeed I think they would seem *very weak* to any *prudent judicious indifferent persons* that were convinced of the heinousness of that *Sin* of *Schism* which they are produced to *excuse*) yet I think they are the *lives* and *unseriousness* of some of our *conformable Clergy*, that are indeed their *decretory arguments*. For this indeed seems to be the great reason that makes them *fancy* our ministery *less edifying* than their *own*, because they come possessed with *irreverence* to their *persons* (for I do not perceive that themselves pretend the same difference in hearing such of ours for whom they have entertained a greater respect) and that *negligence of life* and *unserious way of Preaching* seem to be the true occasions of that *irreverence*. Now my way of *defence* is not the least to justifie their *vices* or *imprudences*, or to defend their *persons* against *publick Justice* (as they seem to mis-understand us, when they charge us with the *Patronage of Prophaneness* upon account of these Persons) but to let them un- §. 9.

 derstand

derstand how little our *Church* is indeed concerned in their *defence*. For if the *Character* of a *Clergy-man* here described, answer the true design of the Church (as I have shewn that it does by *Injunctions* and *Canons* produced from her since her *Reformation*) then it will appear that such persons are so far *unconformable* as they are disliked (for it is plain the person *here described* can neither prove *impious* in his *life*, nor *imprudent* or *trifling* in his *Preaching*) and sure themselves will not think it equitable that our *Church* should be charged with the errors of *Non-conformists*.

§. 10. The only thing therefore that may seem *blame-worthy* here, is that the *Canons* of the *Church* are not executed on such persons with *due severity*. But neither will this excuse their *Separation*; for First, they are not concerned to see this *Justice* done, so as to be obliged upon *neglect* of it to withdraw from our *Communion*. For neither do they suffer in a *personal regard*, the Ordinances Administred by the *irregular* or *imprudent Clergy*, whilst permitted, not depending on their *personal sanctity* or *prudence*, and therefore being as efficacious to the *well disposed recipients* as otherwise; nor are they entrusted with a *publick charge*, so as to be responsible for *publick miscarriages* when *irremediable* by them: And therefore Secondly, all the blame of such connivances is to be laid, not on the *Government* whose *standing established Rules* oblige them to a *severer care*; but on the *Governours*, who may also be charged with *Non-conformity*, when they do not act according to the *Rules prescribed by themselves*; and therefore it will be very unjust

for

for these personal neglects to separate from their *Government* and *Communion* : Especially considering Thirdly, that *Separation* on these regards is so far from *preventing* the *inconvenience* or *remedying* it, as that indeed it does but *transfer* the *blame* from the *Governours* to such *Separatists* (though they think to avoid it) by affording an *Apology*, by them *unanswerable*, to *Governours* for such *personal neglects* ; "That "the *Delinquents* cannot be *perswaded* to reform "themselves, and that a *power* of perswading "only is allowed them by these *Seperating Bre-* "*thren* ; that even as to that *coercive power* chal- "lenged by themselves, yet it is not *prudent* to "exercise it without any *probable hopes of suc-* "*cess*, that being the way to expose it to con- "tempt, which in a power which has nothing "to render it *coercive* but the *Sacredness* of its "*esteem* in the *opinion* of the *Delinquent*, may en- "danger the *whole Authority*, as the *loss of that* "will occasion a *general impunity*, a much *greater* "*evil* than any *single inconvenience*. And seeing the *multitudes* of *Sects* and *Communions* ready to receive a *punished delinquent*, and the *disparaging opinions* introduced by them concerning *Authority* ; these things upon their principles, will go far to excuse *Governours* from the *execution* of the *Canons*. Where the *blame* will afterwards lye themselves may understand without any suggestion of mine. I shall beseech them to bestow some *serious* and *unprejudiced* thoughts upon it.

Now though the *following Advices* be calculated principally for the use of the *Clergy*, who are *more entrusted*, and therefore *more obliged* to caution, §. 11.

caution, on the account of the *multitude*, who depend upon their *conduct*, as well as themselves; yet are there several things *proportionably* useful for the *Laity* also. For there is as much *truth* in that pretence of our *Brethren* for equalling the *Laity* to the *Clergy*, as there was in that of the *Rebellious Congregation* of *Corah*, that all the *People of God* is *holy*, that *Christians*, as well as the *Israelites*, are called the (*a*) *Lords Heritage*, that *Christ* has made us all (*b*) *Priests to God and his Father*, that we are *built up a holy* (*c*) *Priesthood to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*. And accordingly *common Christians* are obliged to the same Offices to the *Heathen common World*, as the *Clergy* are to the *Laity*. Thus they are to shew them a *good example*, to be *lights in the World*, to *reprove* and *exhort Delinquents*, and to *offer up Mystical Sacrifices for the whole World*. And if they were to be received *adult* to the *profession of Christianity*, there would be the same care for *purity of intention* in *Laicks* as there is now in *Clergy-men*. Thus in the *Primitive times* none were received to this *profession*, but they who had first given some *evidences* of their *sincerity*, sometimes by enduring some rigorous *initiatory Penances*, such as was usually practiced in *admissions* to *Pagan Mysteries*. Thus *Three days Fast* was prescribed in the time of the (*d*) Author of the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions*, and the *Quadragesimal Fast* was appointed before the most antient *Anniversary for Baptism*, *Easter*: Sometimes by giving some experiment of real service. So *Arnobius* was not trusted till he had written in defence of the *Christian Religion*. And St. *Cyril* of *Hierusalem* in

(*a*) 1 S. Pet. V. 3.
(*b*) Rev. I. 6. V. 10. xx. 6.
(*c*) 1 S. Pet. II. 9.
(*d*) Recogn. L. III. & VI.

in his (e) *Homilies* to the *competentes* is very earnest in urging the necessity of a *sincere* and *cordial intention*: And from this *great caution* of admitting *Heathens* to an *intuition* of their *mysteries*, it was that, after all *indications* of their *sincerity*, even *adults* were not admitted without the *Testimony* of *Susceptors* or *God-fathers*, persons of *approved gravity* and *sincerity*. And the same *obligations* are in reason incumbent now on those who are *adult*, though *Baptized* in their *Nonage*. If I were not unwilling to be tedious, it had been easie to have shewn in all the other qualifications, how even *private Christians* are in their proportion obliged, though not in so eminent a degree, and rather excused from that, by its impossibility to their circumstances, than its unnecessariness. But that which I shall at present especially recommend to the perusal of the *Laity*, is *Letter* I. *Numb.* XXVI. where they may find such *Prescriptions* as may prevent many *disconsolations* in the *Practice of Pity* to which the neglect of them does expose many *seriously devout Persons*.

(e) Præf. & Catech. III.

§. 12. It has also, by some worthy Friends, been thought requisite for rendring the present attempt more useful for our *Britannick Churches*, to recommend to the persons, concerned in these *Advices*, the Study of their *Publick Records*, the *Homilies*, and *Articles*, and *Books of Ordination* and *Common-Prayer*, and *Canons* and *Constitutions* since the *Reformation*, though this indeed is easily reducible to that head of *skill in all those Controversies that divide Communion*; for this seems to have been the adæquate design of the *Church* herein, to shew what she thought necessary

sary to be *believed*, or at least, *not factiously contradicted*, by such as were to be admitted to her *Communion*. And for the better understanding her *true sense* in this affair, and its *Vindication* from the *misunderstandings* of her *Adversaries*, it were very requisite to read the *whole History* of the *Reformation*, and to observe the *sentiments* and *temper* of the *principal persons* engaged therein; and by what kind of *mediums* her proceedings have been *justified* in the several *Ages*, and against the several *Adversaries*, respectively. By this means you will best understand the *difference* betwixt her *impositions*; which of them were intended as conditions of *Catholick Communion*, that is, as *fundamentals*; and which only of her *particular*, that is as *prudent* and *probable*, and not obliging to an *internal assent*, but only an *exterior* peaceable *acquiescency* (for certainly the *Church* intended some of *both kinds*) and the late way of requiring an *external assent* only to the *Articles indefinitely*, without prescribing any *prudential limitations*, how far that is to be extended, and admitting a *liberty* of *straining the Articles* in favour of our own opinions, without any consideration of the *Controversies* therein designed to be defined by the *Church*, may be expounded so *licentiously* as to open a gap for the most *Pestilent Heresies*.

§. 13. In the Second *Letter*, I confess many things in the *improvement* of the Proposals there laid down, and in the *Catalogues* of *Books*, might have been more accurately enlarged, but that I conceived these sufficient to *initiate a Novice*, which I have there signified to have been my *utermost design*, and I doubt whether it would be

be *prudent* to discourage beginners with the *Prospect* of *too great a task*. In my censure of *School-Divinity*, there is one *fundamental defect* omitted, which I look on as so very *considerable*, and of so extreamly *fallacious consequence* to them that rely on it, and yet never observed, that I know of, that I thought it worthy a particular mention here. That is, *that the greatest and most Sacred mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation are explained as to their Theological consequences from the principles of the Peripatetick Philosophy, as borrowed by them from the modern Translations and Commentaries of the* Arabians. It is plain that all the use of *Philosophy* in affairs of this nature cannot be to *discover* any truth *anew*, but only to *explain* the sense of the *Authors* delivering it; and that that *Philosophy* alone can be useful to this purpose, whose *Language* was observed by them; and that not *Aristotle* but *Plato* was then generally followed, not only by the *generality* of the *Philosophers* of that age, but, in accommodation to them, his *Language* observed by the *Scriptures* themselves, especially St. *John* I. and by the *generality* of the *Fathers*, those of greatest repute in both the *Occidental* and *Oriental Churches*, the pretended *Areopagite* and St. *Augustine* himself, to whom the *Schools* are most beholden, St. *Basil*, both St. *Gregory*'s *Nazianzen* and *Nyssen*, St. *Chrysostom*, *&c.* So that this way of proceeding is lyable to two very *fundamental mistakes* (which should be studiously avoided in affairs of so *great concernment.*) First of *explaining Platonick language by Peripatetick Philosophy*; Secondly of *explaining the antient Peripatetick Philosophy by the present expositions of the modern* Arabians.

These

§. 14. These with the other *defects* there mentioned would methinks invite some generous *Advancers of Learning* to review the whole *Foundations* of our *Modern School-Divinity*, which would be an attempt becoming the *ingenuity* and *inquisitiveness* of the *Age* we live in. And seeing I have taken this occasion of mentioning such a design; it may be it may not prove altogether *unacceptable*, perhaps something *necessary* to *clear* my *meaning*, to propose such a way of managing it, as I conceive most convenient, which I most willingly refer to the *censures* of persons more *skillful* and *experienced*. That I think would be First to distinguish accurately betwixt such Questions as are to be decided by *reason*, and such whose *principles* are either *wholly* or *principally* derived from *Revelation*. In the former the *School-men* may be more securely trusted, their excellency lying in the *closeness* of their *discourse*. But here it self, it were well that their *principels* were *reformed*; especially in such an Age as this is, care should be taken that nothing be taken up *precariously* upon the *Authority* of any however *celebrated Philosopher* (a practice too frequent among them) but what might sufficiently recommend it self by its own *nature* and *intrinsick reasonableness*.

§. 15. And then for those which are derived from *Revelation*, it is plain that their whole decision must be derived from *Testimonies* either of *Scriptures* or *Ecclesiastical Authors*, the producing whereof seems to be the principal design of the *Master of the Sentences*; though some things are added in the *Sums*, from *Maimonides* whom *Aquinas* used in an Antient *Latin* Translation, con-

concerning *Prophesie* and the *Ceremonial Law*. Concerning these therefore it seems to me expedient that some excellent persons, skilled not only in *Ecclesiastical*, but *Rabbinical*, and *Philosophical Learning*, and indeed generally in *Oriental Philology*, would undertake a *Historical account* of them; wherein he should, First shew *Historically* how the *whole Article* was believed and *taught* in the several *Ages* of the *Church*; what *forms of speaking* were used by the *Fathers* concerning it; how it was *expressed*, and how much concerning it *believed*, in its *first simplicity*; how afterwards *additional explanations* were *introduced* and by what *degrees*: What was the *first occasion* of the several *Controversies*; who were their principal *Hæresiarchs*; how they were *disposed* in their *manners*, and how *addicted* in the *Studies*; wherein their *Hæresies* did truly consist, whether in the *perniciousness* of their *Doctrines*, or their *factious manner* of *propagating* them to the prejudice of the *Churches peace*. If in the *perniciousness* of their *Opinions*; then it were well it were shewn, First what those *Opinions* were, as near as could be from the *Hereticks* own words; and Secondly upon what *occasion* first *entertained*; and Thirdly by what *degrees promulged*; and Fourthly by what *arguments defended*, and among them which were *principal*, and which only *secondary* and *accessary*; and Fifthly by what success *received*, by whom *seconded*, and by whom *opposed*; Sixthly, by what *degrees condemned*: First, by what *Fathers*, Secondly by what *Provincial*, and Thirdly by what *General Councils*; and how all their proceedings were resented by the *Catholick Church*

diffusive:

diffusive: And in all these *degrees* of *censure* to shew distinctly, First how far both Parties were *agreed*, and wherein they *differed*; and Secondly as to their *differences*, to shew what was *condemned* as *pernicious* (and among *them* what was counted *more* and what *less pernicious*) and what only as *improbable*, for it seems plain that many *errors* of *Heretickes* were not counted *Heresies*; and Thirdly the *degrees* of *unanimity* in the *Church* in her *censures*: what censures were *generally received* and *confirmed* by the *Catholick Church diffusive*; what only by her *Representative*, in *General Councils*; what only by *particular Churches* in *Provincial*; what only by *particular persons*, how *numerous* or *eminent* soever; and Fourthly the Arguments alledged in defence of the *Ecclesiastical censures*, especially such of them on which the *Churches Resolution* was *principally grounded*, and of which her *Champions* were most *confident*; and indeed if these were *judiciously* chosen, I think it would not be amiss if the *weaker* were quite *omitted*, both because they are perfectly *unnecessary* as depending entirely on the *conclusiveness* of the others, and involved in the same *success*; and because with some *Cavillers*, (who are glad of any occasions of *Carping*,) they might prejudice the *principal cause*, there being no more *politick* way for betraying the *Truth* in so *inquisitive* an *Age* as this, than to offer to defend it by *unconclusive arguments*. And the same way of proceeding may be proportionably applyed to *Theological questions* of meaner concernment.

When

When thus the *matter of Fact* had been thus §. 16.
plainly *represented*, it would then be *seasonable* to proceed to a *positive judgment* according to these *Historical evidences.* And in order hereunto it would be further expedient to consider the *first Originals* of every *notion*, what foundation every *Article* had in the *actual belief* of the persons to whom it was revealed, *antecedently* to the *Revelation*, and therefore how the *Revelations* were likely to be understood by them; Which being discovered, then to examine in the Second place what might be deduced concerning the whole *Article* from such *Originals*, whether *Pagan Philosophy*, or *Opinions* or *Practices* prevailing among the *Rabbinical Jews*, or the *Hellenists*, for whose use the *Scriptures* were principally designed. When this is done, then it would be convenient, Thirdly to compare the Article so explained with the *Striptures* as understood by the *Primitive Fathers*, to see how far it was *approved*, and where corrected and amended by *Revelation.* And this may be *proportionably* applyed, not only to the *Primitive Doctrines* of the *Church*, but also, to her *latter explications* and *modes* of *expressions* opposed to the several *Hereticks* opposing it. Concerning which the method of accurate *enquiry* would require that First it were examined whether only the *Doctrine* were pretended derived from their Ancestors, or also their own *explications* and *Phrases* of expressing it. If only the *Doctrine*, then to examine whether indeed the expression of the *Ancients* concerning it were *aequivalent* with their own. If also the *individual expressions*, then to examine the *sense* of the *Antients*

 concerning

concerning ſuch *expreſſions*, and the *Authors* that uſed them by the *Rules* already propounded concerning the *Decrees* of the *Church* againſt *Hereticks*; and whether they uſed them in the ſame ſenſe as afterwards.

§. 17. When *materials* were thus prepared, and the *Truth* thus *diſcovered*, which muſt needs ſuppoſe a *conſiderable voluminouſneſs*, and probably ſome *difference* of *opinion* in the *diverſity* of *Authors* requiſite to be employed on ſo great a *Task*; then it would be further ſeaſonable that ſome *judicious* and *prudent perſons* ſhould reduce the whole to a *Compendium*, (which might ſerve as a Text for *Scholaſtical diſputes*, inſtead of *Lombard*) with references to the larger *Treatiſes* that they might be more readily conſulted on occaſion. And the beſt way of contriving this, would I think, be to diſtinguiſh this *Compendium* into *two parts*: The former of *Natural*, and the latter of *revealed Theology*, where every thing might be reduced to its *proper Principles*. Many other *expediencies* hereof might have been mentioned, at preſent I ſhall only mention one which I conceive more *conſiderable*. That is, that hereby perſons might not be invited to meddle beyond their *abilities*; for the *Principles* of theſe two parts have ſo little *mutual dependence* on each other; and the *natural endowments* requiſite in the *perſons* that ſhould undertake them are ſo very *different*, and ſo rarely *conjoyned* in *one perſon* (a *Rational judgment* without much *reading*, being ſufficient for that *Divinity* which is *purely natural*; and *much reading* and a *tenacious memory* and a *Philological Critical judgment* being requiſite for that which is *revealed*) that it

is no way convenient that every one who might attempt the *rational part*, though with very excellent *success*, should immediately, without consideration of his own *abilities*, presume himself fit to venture on the other that concerns *Revelations*. And indeed any sober considerative person may easily observe how untoward the *Rationalists* of this *Age*, who decry *Book-learning*, prove when they are engaged on a Subject that requires *reading*; what improper notions they impose on terms they do not understand; how strangely they mistre-present their Adversaries meaning, disputing many times against *Chimera's* of their own brains; how difficultly they yield to that which would not once be scrupled by *skillfull persons*; how in answering they propose such possible cases as are perfectly destitute of all actual probability. And a proportionable *slightness* is ordinarily observable in the *rational discourses* of great *Philologers*, though I confess some very excellent persons have been accurate in both; but such instances, being more *rare*, cannot prejudice the *general Rules* we are now discoursing of. Then in both parts it were well (in imitation of *Origen* περὶ Ἀρχῶν) to premise *First* what *Propopositions* in every *Article* were to be taken for *unquestionable*, as being evident from *Reason* or *Revelation* as explained by *Tradition*; and it would be more useful if it were distinctly shewn what kind of evidence agreed to every Proposition *particularly*. For thus what were *self-evident* from *natural reason* might be relyed on in disputes against even *Atheists* that are not *Sceptical* (and they that are, destroy all *discourse* as denying all

Principles) what were clearly consequent from the notion of a *Deity* and *Providence*, would be of force against our modern *Pagan Theists*, and all persons admitting such a thing as Religion; what were clear from *Old Testament Revelations* could not be denyed by the *Jews*, especially if so *expounded*, and that *unanimously* by their own *Rabbins*, what were clear from the *New Testament* must be owned by all *Christians* that admit of it, even those that extend its *perfection* to all *indifferent Punctillio's*; what were clear from it as expounded by *Primitive Catholick Tradition*, might be taken for granted against all such as were willing to stand to that *Tryal*; and Lastly that which had no other evidence than the *actual definition* of the *Church*, how *groundlesly* soever, could only be made use of against such Persons as are for a *blind obedience* to such a *Church* without examining the *reasons* of such *definitions*. And in all these instances it were well to note what were *indeed evident* from such *Principles*, and what were also *admitted* for such by the *Persons* acknowledging such *Principles*, which would be further very considerable in order to the *success*, seeing many things may be *indeed rational*, yet not *acknowledged* such by the *persons concerned*. Yet I do not intend that every person should be permitted to dispute each of these things *publickly* as *professing* his own *dissatisfaction* concerning them, but that they who are called to it *Providentially* (as in this *Age* frequent occasions will occur) in order to the satisfaction of others may have a ready *Promptuary* to have recourse unto in time of *necessity*. Otherwise the *Church* ought,

as

as a *Church*, to prescribe the belief of some things as a *necessary condition* of her *Communion.*

When these *Principles* were thus *methodically* §. 18.
disposed, it would then be seasonable to improve them in the *Controversies* whose free discussion might be tolerated among *good* and *peaceable Christians*, if among these a *caution* were had for the *retrenching* such as were *unnecessary* and *unedifying*. This way, if it were prudently managed, would not only afford *solid Principles* for the *Schools*, but also lay the most probable *foundation* for the *reunion* of *Christendom*. For if things were thus accurately enquired into, I verily believe, *Governours* would find a necessity of remitting their *rigour* in several *impositions*, and *Subjects* would discover the great *necessity* of *obedience* and the *no-necessity* of those reasons produced for their *Separation*. But I must confess the work is too great to be attempted by *private persons* how considerable soever, and therefore would require not only the *Patronage*, but also the *concurrent industry* of *Governours*; and by how much the greater the *Authority* were that countenanced it, by so much the more likely it would be to *thrive*. For great *freedom* were requisite in the *correction* of *present errors*, and that could not be so safely trusted to the management of *private persons*, and would receive with less *envy* and *faction* from the *Church*, and would not prove a *precedent* for any *Factious Innovations*. Only I must confess that the Doctrine of *Infallibility* whilst maintained will hardly be reconcileable with a *candid review* of what has been *already*, though never so *erroneously* received. But First even among them, it were

well they distinguished what had been decided by the Church from what had not been so; and Secondly even among them *abuses*, never so *universally received*, if not *Canonically decided*, might be *Reformed*; and Thirdly considering that a *preservation* of their *Authority*, and a *prevention* of *Innovations*, which they conceive effectually performable only by that *pretence*, seem to be their *principal inducements* to it, and that those may be thus provided for, by being *themselves* the *Authors* of such *Reformation*; it may be they might not find it so inexpedient to yield even this which seems to be the *principal* cause that makes our breaches *irreconcileable*. And certainly if it would please God to inspire *Governours* with a *serious* and *industrious*, and *candid*, yet *active Spirit* for the service of the *Church*; much more might be done, than is, for the *Restoration* of *Religion* and *Unity*, and the *prevention* of those dayly *scandalous*, both *Opinions* and *Practices*, which all *good Christians* do so seriously deplore? And that he would be pleased to do so their confederated *Prayers* and *endeavours* might be very *available*.

Letter

Letter I.

CONTENTS.

THE *Introduction* Number I. *The design of the following Advices,* II. *The danger of miscarriage in the* Clerical Calling, *the consequent necessity of a* Call from God *for undertaking it; how we are to judge of this* Call *in a rational way, the general requisites thereunto,* III. *The first Requisite,* A pure Intention, *what it is, and how to be tryed,* IV, V, VI. *The second Requisite,* Natural Gifts, *how we may hence conclude a* Calling, VII. *Why these* Gifts *are called* Natural. *What they are that are necessary in regard of* Knowledge. *All* Theological Knowledge *not simply necessary for every ordinary* Parochian, *but what is* more immediately practical. *Men are to be fitted for further knowledge by the practice of what they know already,* VIII. *The great use and probable successfulness of*

this Method in reducing Hereticks *or* Schismaticks, IX. *The knowledge of a* Clergyman *ought to be not only that of a* Practitioner, *but that of a* Guide. *Hence is inferred, First a necessity of knowing and understanding* Fundamentals *wherein all agree, as of the* Apostles Creed. *From whence is also further inferred a necessity of understanding, First the* Scriptures, *and therefore the* Originals *wherein they were written, especially the* Greek, X. XI. *Secondly, the* Fathers *of the* first *and* purest Centuries. *The necessity of this,* XII. *The* expediency *of it,* XIII. *Secondly, a necessity of skill in such* Controversies *as* divide Communions, XIV. *Thirdly, a skill in* Casuistical Divinity. *The insufficiency of* Pulpit-reproofs, *and the necessity of dealing with* particular Consciences *in order to the Reformation of* particular Persons, XV, XVI, XVII. Requisites *for inducing the* People *to a* Practice *of their* Duty, *when known: First a skill in the* Ars Voluntatis, XVIII. *Secondly,* Boldness *and* Courage *in telling them of their duty. How necessary this qualification is, and how much to be tendered. How it may be best performed without offending on the other extream of* Petulancy,

lancy, XIX. *Thirdly, a* ſweet *and* ſociable, *yet* grave *and* ſerious, Converſation. *How theſe two ſeeming contradictory extreams may be reconciled*, XX. *Fourthly, a* holy *and* exemplary Life, XXI. *That their* Lives *may be* exemplary, *two conditions are neceſſary: First, that they be* Excellent, XXII. *Secondly, that their* Excellency *be* conſpicuous. *How this* conſpicuity *may be ſo contrived as that it may not hinder* Humility *and* Modeſty, XXIII. *The laſt Requiſite, a* firm *and* ſtable Reſolution. *How to be tryed*, XXIV. *Theſe Advices ſeaſonable for ſuch as have* already undertaken *Orders, as well as ſuch as* only deſign *them. That theſe* perſonal qualifications *will ſuperſede the neceſſity of* particular Rules, XXV. *Two things further requiſite for a nearer accommodation of the forementioned qualifications to practice: First, that an obſervation of them from a principle of* Divine Love, *and on a* rational account, *is more expedient both for* perſonal comfort *and* publick edification, XXVI. *Second, ſome* general Rules *in managing a* Parochial Cure *for bringing the* People *to a* Ruleable temper, XXVII.

The

The *Catalogue* of the Writings of ſuch *Chriſtian Authors* as Flouriſhed before the Converſion of the *Roman Empire* to *Chriſtianity*. Pag. 131.

Letter

Letter II.

CONTENTS.

THE Introduction and Heads of the ensuing Discourse, Numb. I. *What is meant by* Scholastical Divinity. *What to be observed in* Oratory. *The* Light *and* Certainty *of the* Rational Faculties *supposed antecedently to all Theological proof,* II. *A method of managing* Reason *most advantageously in Theological Controversies,* III. *The* usefulness *of* Reason *and* School-Divinity. *In what principal Controversies they are especially seasonable,* IV. *A censure of* School-Divinity, *and how it is to be used,* V. *The most accurate way of finding out the sense of the Scripture. The use of* Philological Learning *in general in order hereunto: Particularly, First of those* Tongues *wherein they were* Originally *written; Secondly, the* Idioms *of those* Tongues; *Thirdly, the* Idioms *of*

of the Writers; *Fourthly, the* Antiquities; *the* Customs *of the* Zabij, Chaldæan *and* Phœnician; *their* History, Chronology *and* Geography. *The way of judging the Testimonies of the* Fathers *concerning* Traditions, VI. *The use of* Secular Philosophy *in order to* School-Divinity, VII. *The use of* Secular Learning *to the* Text *of the* Holy Scriptures; *of the Antient* Greek Poetry; *of the* Greek, *especially the* Stoical Philosophy. *An* Apology *for it*, VIII. *The means for unriddling the* Mystical senses *of the Antient* Poets *and* Philosophers, *and* Publick Idolatries *of the* Heathens; *the* Oneirocriticks *and* Hieroglyphicks. *An* Apology *for their use in expounding* Prophetick Books *of* Scripture, IX. *The* Authors *to be read for initiating a* Young Student *in each of the particulars advised*, X. *The* Method *to be observed for preventing* distraction *in so great a* variety, XI.

An

An Advertisement to the Reader, in the SECOND EDITION.

AS it becomes us not to deny our *Second Thoughts*, that farther improvement which *Time* and *Experience* will necessarily suggest for bettering them; so I am sensible of the inconvenience that does thereby frequently redound to the Buyers of *First Editions*. I have therefore endeavoured so to temper my *Corrections*, as that the Justice I do my self in them, may prove least offensive to them who are already furnished with the former *Edition* of these *Letters*. The *Appendix* concerning *Sanchoniathon* is intirely *New*, and therefore I have ordered my Bookseller to Print some Supernumerary Copies, that they may have them singly who have the *Letters* alone. And I have endeavoured that the amendments of what has been published formerly, might be with as little prejudice to the usefulness of the former *Edition* as was possible. My principal care has therefore been to clear the *Sense*, and where it might be, with the least *Variation*. Where breakings of the *Sentences*, or *Transpositions*, or *Parenthesis* and properer *Words*, and more expressive of my *Sense*, and more suited to my *Reasoning*, would do it, I have not designedly aimed at any thing more. Where a little *Addition* would not only be seasonable, but of great weight and consequence to my main design, there I hope I may be excused for allowing my self a little Liberty. But as I have not taken this liberty often, nor made it a Pretence for long *Digressions*; so where I have

used

used it has been on the now mentioned terms, where would prove *momentous* as well as *seasonable*. The Correction of mistakes it is a thing that I hope will need no *Apology*. *Good* Men will not only excuse me for doing it, but would have just reason to blame me if I had not done it. The principal are in the *Catalogue* of the *Primitive Writers*. I have there Added some things from latter *Editions*, which were not extant when my *Letters* were first published. I have also, upon better thoughts, *Transposed* some Authors names, as to the times they lived in; and, where it might be difficult to guess why I did so, I have touched at the reasons, so that both the unskilful might have direction, and that the more skilful might also understand my intimations. The narrowness of my present design would not give me leave to insist on them more largely. Where there is any difference between the *Letters*, especially the *Second*, and the *Appendix*, the *Appendix* is to be taken for my present thoughts; and whether are truer let the Learned Judg. It will not be amiss, in order to their judging, that they see the reasons of both.

I thought it became me in *Gratitude*, to retain my former *Dedication* to my Deceased *Patron*. And because his *License* and *Approbation* was indeed one great reason of that Address, I thought it also convenient to keep them as they were. It is convenient as a *License*, because our present unsettlement will not permit a new one, here in *England*. But that which will make it always seasonable is, its being a *Recommendation* as well as a *License*, and a *Recommendation* from a Person of so great *Authority* in our *Britannick Churches*. The in-

inconſiderableneſs of my Perſon, and the weakneſs of my performance, as well as my unfitneſs as a *Laick* for promoting ſuch deſigns with any *Authority*, do make me ſtand in need of ſuch ſupports. So that I am ſtill concerned in *Intereſt*, as well as *Gratitude*, to continue it, and to thank God for it. If any one receives benefit by it, let him return his *Thanks* to *God*, who is uſually pleaſed to chooſe the meaneſt moſt unlikely Inſtruments for driving on his own good deſigns, and reward me only with his *Prayers*. Some alterations in the Catalogue, have been made alſo to this *third* Edition.

Letter

Letter I.

A LETTER of Advice to a young Student

Designing the Susception of

HOLY ORDERS.

SIR,

I. HAving got that opportunity of fulfilling your Requests since your departure, which I wanted when you were present; (because, besides the gravity of the Subject whereon you have employed me, and my own natural averseness from such insignificancies, and the necessity now, if ever, of plain dealing; I believe your self would rather have it bestowed on material Advices, than empty Complements;) I shall therefore, like the downright and truly just *Areopagites.* ἄνευ πάσης ὑποκρίσεως, make use of it, without any further Ceremonial Addresses. I.

II. II. First therefore, when you desire advice for your Behaviour in that holy Function you design to undertake; I hope you do not intend that I should be prolix in insisting on particulars. For both that has already been performed at large by many others (particularly you may, if you please, consult our late Excellent Vice Chancellor's Visitation Rules *, where you will find most Capacities provided for, or, among the Ancients, who usually speak more from the heart, and experience of Piety, than our *Modern*, though otherwise *more accurate* Authors, St. *Chrysostome de Sacerdotio*, or St. *Gregories Pastoral*, or St. *Hieroms* 2d. Epist. ad *Nepotianum*: entire Treatises concerning it, though some of them more peculiarly relate to the *Episcopal* or *Sacerdotal* Order) and my own little experience in the *World*, and none in the circumstances considerable in managing a *Clerical Life*, may sure be sufficient to excuse me from such a Task; besides that it must needs prove both tedious and burthensom to your *memory*, and intricate to your *prudence*, to make application of innumerable *Rules* to *circumstances* yet more infinite that can never be foreseen. My design therefore shall be, only to propound such Advices as may *capacitate* you for the discharging of your Function

* Bishop *Tayler*.

Function to the advantage of the Publick where you shall be entrusted, as well as your own Soul, and enable you more advantagiously to judge concerning particulars, than you can by *Rules*; and those grounded on such sure *Principles*, and such excellent ancient *Precedents*, as that, I hope, you shall have no reason to complain that they are *unpracticable*, because they are not calculated from *present experience*.

III. To which purpose, before you are actually Ordained (if you be not already) I must conjure you by all that is dear unto you, to consider what it is, and with what design you undertake it? That, as it is indeed the Noblest employment to be subservient to the Supreme Governor of the World, in order to his principal designs, to which the World it self, and consequently the vastest Empires, and the greatest Princes, and whatever else is counted glorious in the esteem of inconsiderate Mortals, are subordinate by God himself in a capacity as ignoble as is that of the Body to the Soul; so, the hazard is proportionable: the miscarriage of those noble beings for whose redemption nothing but the blood of God was thought sufficient valuable; and consequently accountable according to the estimate God himself has been pleased III.

to impose upon them: that therefore you remember that you stand in need of greater natural Abilities, and providential Auxiliaries, as it is more difficult to take care of a *multitude*, than of a *single person*; that if supernatural assistances be necessary for the salvation of the most able *private person*, much more they must be so to one not pretending to the greatest abilities in a *personal regard*, when engaged in *publick*; that therefore you never venture on it without *probable presumption* of the *Divine assistance*; that That cannot possibly be presumed if it be undertaken rashly (God never having promised to succour us in dangers voluntarily incurred by ourselves) that it is rash if undertaken without *a Call from God*; (I hope you will not understand me of an *Enthusiastical unaccountable* one, but a *rational* and *providential*, which you may observe the * Church her self to have taken care of in the very Office of Ordination) that you cannot prudently presume a *Call* but upon these principles: that you are principally created for the Divine Service in the improvement of Mankind; that you are engaged in gratitude to perform

* Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, to take upon you this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of his Glory, and the edifying of his People?

Answ. I trust so.

Ordering of Deacons.

form your Duty in it for the many benefits by him conferred on you; that you cannot approve your self grateful uuto him unless you love him, nor veraciously pretend to love him unless you most desire what you conceive most pleasing to him, whence it will follow that you must addict your self to that course of life which is most pleasing to him, if you find your self qualified for it; for this is the only truly *rational Providential Call*, which can without *Enthusiasm* be expected and judged of. Now these qualifications must be a *pure intention*, *natural abilities*, and *a firm immoveable resolution*; for if any of these be wanting, you can never be secure of your *own endeavour*, much less of the *Divine assistance*, for avoiding so imminent a danger.

IV. But because I am not considering these Qualifications, under a meerly natural or moral notion, but as they may ingratiate you with God, and so intitle you to that assistance, without which, as has been shewed, you cannot securely venture on a state of life so extremely dangerous; I conceive it therefore necessary to warn you what it is you may safely trust in this enquiry. First therefore, *for the purity of your designs*, you may observe that *purity* IV.

implies *a freedom from mixture of what is more base with what is more noble*, whether that which is base be *predominant* or only *equal*. And therefore that your designs may be *pure*, you must take care that 1. You design this course of life for those ends alone, which indeed do only render it worthy being designed by you upon a rational account; for this must needs be that which is most excellent. 2. That you do not design this most excellent for any thing less excellent as a more ultimate end: Nay, 3. That you do not design any thing less excellent as an end even *coordinate* with the more excellent, but only as *subordinate*. The latter points are those wherein you may be most easily mistaken, and wherein it will be most difficult to satisfie your self of your own sincerity. At present you may take this Rule: if you find your self so affected with the less noble end as that without it you have reason to think that you should not undertake such a difficult duty for the more noble end alone, you have reason to suspect that the more noble end is *only subordinate*, and the less noble *truly ultimate*; and if you find that your desires of the *less noble end* are such, as that, if you should fail of it, you would find less complacency in your duty, though you

you were ſure thereby to attain that which is ſuppoſed *more noble*, you will have reaſon to ſuſpect your deſigns of the leſs noble end to be, at leaſt, partial and coordinate. Both deſigns are *ſinful*; but with this difference, that the deſigning the more noble end for the leſs noble, argues the Will *perfectly depraved*, and implies no *volition*, but only a *velleity*, for that which is more noble, and therefore can no way entitle ſuch a perſon to the Divine favour; but the making the leſs noble end *coordinate*, argues indeed a *volition*, but ſo imperfect, as cannot move the Divine favour, who cannot chooſe but take ill ſuch a diſhonourable Competitor, and who will by no means yield any of his honour to another, nay, who has further declared it his pleaſure, either to have the whole heart, or none; who will by no means partake with his Adverſaries, but nauſeates and abhors the lukewarm perſon. But though, where this is expreſly deſigned, it can no way deſerve his love, yet, where it is irreptitious and by way of ſurprize, it may, at leaſt, *incline his pity*, upon the ſame account as other ſins of infirmity, to which the ordinary life of Mankind is ſuppoſed obnoxious, and for which allowances are made in the very ſtipulations of the Goſ-

pel. Yet will not this consideration suffice to excuse your neglect of it; for both, *negligence* will make it cease to be a sin of infirmity: and besides the *consequences* of it (whatever the *occasion* may be) are so pernicious, as may make you either less *serviceable* in your Office, or less *acceptable* in your performances of it; and are therefore, with all possible caution, to be avoided.

V. But that I may descend, and speak more plainly and particularly to your case; you may perceive that that which only renders the *Clerical Calling rationally desirable*, is that to which it is upon a *rational account* useful, which can be nothing in the *World* (the design of this Calling being to teach Men how to despise, and easily to part with all such things the World calls *good*) but only *the service of God* in a peculiar manner; and that this service is to fulfil his Will as far as you are capacitated for it by this Calling, which only aims at the salvation of the Souls of Mankind. Be sure therefore that the service of God, and the salvation of souls be intirely your design. And do not trust your saying so, but make some experiment of your *affections*; for it is by their habitual inclinations, and not by some warm lucid intervals

vals of reaſon, that your courſe of life is like to be determined. And you are to remember, that your choice is irrevocable, which muſt oblige you to a ſerious conſideration of what you do before you undertake it. Place therefore your ſelf by frequent meditation in ſuch circumſtances wherein no other end were attainable. Suppoſe the Church were in a ſtate of perſecution, which is not only the *warning*, but alſo the *promiſe*, of the Goſpel; or that your flock were aſſaulted by the malice of any *cruel*, or the ſcandalous example of any *great*, but *powerful*, ſinner; or many other ſuch hazardous caſes which may fall out, though the Church be countenanced by the ſecular Government; would you here follow the example of the *true* (*a*) *ſhepherd*, or the *hireling*? Could you, by your own example, let your flock underſtand that your ſelf did ſeriouſly believe what your Calling muſt have obliged you to have taught and urged to them: *That* (*b*) *the world and all its allurements and menaces are to be deſpiſed, that* (*c*) *all things are to be accounted loſs and dung for the excellency of the knowledge of the croſs; that* (*d*) *tribulations upon this account were glorious, and* (*e*) *being counted worthy to ſuffer for the name of Chriſt peculiarly honourable;*

(*a*) *S.* Joh. 10, 11, 12.

(*b*) S. Joh. xvi. 33. 1 *S.* Joh. xi. 15.

(*c*) Phil. iii. 8.

(*d*) Acts ix 15, 16.

(*e*) Acts v. 41.

(f) S. Mat. v. 11, 12.

rable; that (f) persecutions and reproaches and bitter calumnies suffered for so good a cause were matter of exultation and exceeding joy? Could you even in these difficulties *repeat* your choice if it were reiterable? Or, if you were desperate of any other portion in this life, would you not either wish it undone, or even actually undo it if you could with honour? Do not think this case Romantick even now; for both this will be the securest way of passing a faithful judgment concerning your own temper, especially of that which is necessary for this Calling; and this is one of the chief duties and uses of the calling it self, that you be ready (g) *to assist your flock in the time of necessity*, and (h) *to lay down your life for them*, when it might prove for their advantage. And, believe it, how prosperous soever you may fancy Christianity to be among us, you will find it to be actually true, in a high degree, by the *odium* you must needs incur by a conscientious discharging of your duty: in admonishing scandalous persons, *openly*, and others, *secretly*, of their Vices, and suspending such as would shew themselves incorrigible from the Communion; in *freely*, and sometimes *openly*, rebuking the *great ones* as well as the *mean*, nay sometimes more inal-

(g) Jer. xxiii. 2. Ezek. xxxiv. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

(h) S. Joh. x. 11. Phil. ii. 17.

inasmuch as their example is more pestilential; in generally weakning the hands and hearts, and disappointing the designs, of impious persons, by shaming them out of countenance, by reducing their companions, and generally awing them by a constantly grave and severe behaviour.

VI. And by this experiment you may also perceive whether any less noble end be ingredient in your designing this Calling: whether it be to gratifie the humors of your Friends, or a vain glorious shewing of your parts, or a more honourable condition of life even in this world, or a more plentiful maintenance, or a politick design of making your self considerable in gaining a party for your own designs; though, I confess, the humour of our *Protestant Laity* is generally so self confident, and so little *dependent* on their Ministers (if they do not *despise* them) as that this last Temptation cannot *now* be very dangerous. If you can as chearfully serve God in the absence of these temporal encouragements as with them; if you can, as to your own account, patiently bear with the successlessness of your performances, and satisfie your self in the conscience of having performed your duty; if you be as industrious and careful of a Cure less temporally advanta- VI.

vantagious, as of one that is more, and of persons that cannot, as well as of those that can, reward you; if you know, with the Apostle, how to be abased, as well as how to abound; if you can praise God as cheerfully in a low, as in a prosperous condition; nay more, as having then a title to many blessings of which your prosperous condition is uncapable; if you can find your affections so disintangled from the World, that you are, like (*i*) St. *Paul*, careless of living, upon your own account, but only for the Divine Service; then indeed, and not till then, you may be securely confident of the integrity of your intentions, and venture your self in this *warfare*, as the *Clerical Calling* is expresly called by St. *Paul*, 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4. And as it were certainly most secure that your affections were thus generally alienated from these more ignoble designs, that you may satisfie your own conscience of your own freedom from the suspition of them; so, because the heart is so intolerably deceitful as that its inclinations cannot be certainly discerned till the object be vested with advantagious particular circumstances; and these cannot be so prudently foreseen in general; it will, at least, concern you to make the experiment full in such

(*i*) Phil. i. 23, 24, 25.

ſuch caſes as you are by your own inclinations obnoxious to, and whoſe circumſtances may very probably and frequently occur, and therefore may rationally be expected. Remember that this enquiry be performed, as in the ſight of God, to whom you muſt return an account of this Stewardſhip, and whom it is impoſſible to deceive; and for your own ſake, whoſe intereſt is not meanly, but, greatly and eternally, concerned in it: not only for your perſonal prejudice which you may incur by your imprudence herein, but alſo thoſe miſchievous conſequential miſcarriages, which will involve you deeply in the guilt of the ruin of ſo many Souls as ſhall be engaged therein by the example, or imprudence, or negligence of their guide, who ſhould have been exemplary to them. It were well if you made this the ſubject of a Communion-exerciſe before you take Orders; for when you have deveſted your ſelf of all worldly deſigns, and have God alone before your eyes, and ſpiritual conſiderations; and have acknowledged your own inſufficiency to diſcern the deceitfulneſs of your heart, and have therefore humbly implored the Divine aſſiſtance, and entirely placed your confidence in him, and his inſpirations, not *extraordi-*

traordinary and Enthusiastical, but, *Providential and moral*: That he may be pleased to clear your understanding from all prejudices of your will; that to your understanding, thus prepared, he would suggest the securest motives; that he would enable you with a prudent and distinguishing spirit in passing your judgment, and making your election of them; When, I say, you have done all this, you will then have the greatest moral probability that is possible, that your judgment (if you can satisfie your self of your sincerity in observing these Rules) *is the judgment of right Reason*, and consequently, in the way we are now speaking of, *the Will of God*.

VII. VII. But neither is the purity of design alone sufficient (unless you have abilities for it) either to presume a *Call from God*, or to venture securely and prudently on it. Not the former; for Gods designing men for particular Callings, is, in a *Providential way*, to be concluded from his gifts, which are the talents he intrusts us with, and therefore obliges us to improve, and that after the most advantagious way; so that where God has given natural gifts peculiarly fitting a person for a *particular Calling*, and where it is withal evident, that either they fit him for no *other Calling*,

ling, or, at least, not *so advantagiously*, or to a *Calling not so advantageous*; There, if he follow the dictate of *right Reason* (which is the only *Providential voice of God*) he must needs conclude himself in *prudence* obliged to follow this, rather than any other. But you may be here mistaken, if you consider either your *Gifts*, or your *Calling*, partially. Your *Gifts* you are to consider *universally*, in regard of *themselves*, or their *effects*, which may with any great moral probability be foreseen, whether *natural*, or *accidental*: whether, as some of your *Gifts* do fit you for the *Clerical Calling*, so, they may not equally fit you for *another*? whether, if they fit you *only*, or *peculiarly* for this, yet, you may not have other qualifications that may make it *dangerous*? whether, if you have such as may render it dangerous, the *danger* be *greater*, or *more probable* to come to pass, than the *advantage*? whether, if you have *none*; yet you have not only *some*, but *all*, the qualifications for this Calling? whether, if some be *wanting*, they be either *fewer*, or *less considerable* than those you have? So also, concerning the *Calling* it self, you are to consider whether, all things being allowed for, it be likely to prove more *advantagious*, or *disadvantagious*, to you? whe-

whether it be more *necessary*, or only more *convenient*? whether if more *necessary*, it be also more *secure*, especially in regard of your *greater interests*? And, concerning all these enquiries, you may fall into great mistakes, if you have not before rectified your intention, and so fixed on a right end, from whence you may deduce faithful measures of things. It will therefore here concern you to use all possible prudence and caution; and you cannot be excused if you use less than you would in a case wherein all your secular fortunes and your life it self were deeply hazarded, seeing these things are incomparably less trivial.

VIII. VIII. I hope you will not so far suspect me of *Pelagianism* as to put me to the trouble of an *Apology* for calling these *qualifications natural*. My meaning is not, that these *natural qualifications* alone are sufficient for discharging the *Clerical Calling*? Or, that those *Auxiliaries* that are superadded the only *natural*; but only, that all superadded Auxiliaries are grounded on the improvement of such as are natural, not as *merits* rigorously obliging God *in point of Justice*, but as *motives* mercifully perswading and inducing him, who is of himself already *munificent*; so that the principal and

and original ground of expecting these *supernatural Auxiliaries*, which can only be hoped for by them who are peculiarly called, can *antecedently* (as it is plain that the ground of their hope must be *antecedent*) be grounded on nothing but what is *natural*. To let this therefore pass (that this whole discourse may be deduced home to your case) it will be necessary to shew what these qualifications are, which will best be understood by their accommodation to the design for which you intend them. That therefore I suppose to be the taking of a particular charge upon you of the souls of a particular Congregation; so that according to the several ways of the miscarriage of such souls, you ought to be contrarily qualified for their security. And the miscarriage of their souls being occasioned by their *non performance of their duty*, your qualifications must consist in such requisites as may induce them to that performance. And these will, in general, be reduced to two heads: *such as may be necessary for informing them in their duty, and such as may induce them to practise it*; for in both these put together their security does adæquately consist. And in order to these two ends you must be endued with two requisites: *Knowledge*,

for convincing their underſtandings; and *prudence*, for perſwading their wills. By *knowledge* I do not ſo much mean that which is *Speculative* and *Scholaſtical*, as that which is more immediately *Practical*. For I ſuppoſe your charge to conſiſt principally of the *illiterate multitude*, and that if you have any *intelligent learned Laick* that may be capable of higher things, yet that it is more rare and caſual; and that in theſe qualifications, I am ſpeaking of, we are not ſo much to conſider what is *rare* and *extraordinary*, as what is *frequent* and *uſual*; what is *uſeful* and *convenient*, as what is *abſolutely neceſſary*. For both thoſe *extraordinary occaſions* cannot ſo much oblige to a peculiar proviſion, eſpecially in thoſe multitudes which are neceſſary for theſe ſervices of the Church, all which cannot be expected capable of them; and thoſe caſes, being *extraordinary*, may be ſupplied by a few peculiarly gifted that way, ſeeing it is Gods uſual way thus to diſtribute thoſe χαρίσματα, which are indeed *convenient* for the edification of the Catholick Church *in general*, but not *abſolutely neceſſary* for every *particular* charge. For theſe ends therefore, wherein your other ſtudies of more neceſſary concernment, or the averſion of your own *genius*, may not incline

incline you, or afford you opportunity, or enable you, to attain ſuch skill your ſelf as were convenient; it will be ſufficient that you hold correſpondence with ſuch as have it, whom you may conſult with as occaſion ſhall require, and ſo not be altogether unprovided even for theſe extraordinary occurrences. But that which will more peculiarly and indiſpenſably concern you, is that *more immediately practical* knowledge, which all are ſome way bound to obſerve, and of which none, which act prudently in their common concernments of the world, may be preſumed uncapable. And it were well that you would reduce all other ſpeculative knowledge to this, as it is certainly deſigned by God. My meaning is, that you would not begin with *notions* in inſtructing others, but that you would firſt ſtir them up to *practiſe* ſuch duties as are by all parties acknowledged to be eſſentially obligatory under the ſtate of Chriſtianity (as, God be praiſed, principles ſufficient for moſt of theſe are admitted by all conſiderable parties that violate the peace of *Chriſtendom*, however otherwiſe diſunited among themſelves) and ſo by that means bring them to a *carefulneſs of their ways*, and *a tenderneſs of conſcience*, and *an inquiſitiveneſs*

after their duty universally whatever it may be; which will prepare them for what other instructions they may afterwards prove capable of; and will be of excellent use, both for rendring your advice acceptable and useful to them, when they first sensibly experience its necessity before it be communicated; and for preventing the infusion of any frivolous and unprofitable notions, which are very dangerous to popular capacities (who are usually more *passionate* than *judicious*, and are too prone to impose their own private sentiments in things, they do not understand, as well as those they do, on others, and so to make them the badges and characteristicks of subdividing parties) and will be the best measure for suiting and proportioning their knowledge to their capacities; for they are certainly capable of so much knowledge whose usefulness they are capable of apprehending; and no more is *necessary*, if I may not say, *expedient*, to be communicated to them.

IX. IX. I could have shewn you, in many regards, how incomparably more advantagious this way is, even for the reduction of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, than that which is ordinarily made use of, an abrupt disputation: for by this means you will find

find that the only true causes of *heretical* and *schismatical pravity*, *obstinacy* and *perversity of will*, and *prejudices of the world*, and *the vain desire of applause and victory*, and *their preingagement in a party*, and *that shame and unwillingness to yield* (even to truth it self, when it appears their Adversary) which unawares surprizes the most innocently meaning Men, will be removed before your reasons be propounded, which, if by them they be thought more convincing, they must, upon these suppositions, needs prevail; and that the want of the removal of these is that which ordinarily makes disputations so successless; nay that the *conversion* it self of the *persons* without the *purgation* of these *prejudices*, might indeed enlarge our *party* (a design too vain to be aimed at by any peaceable pious Christian) but would never be advantagious to the *persons themselves* (the charity to whose *souls* ought to be the principal inducement to a rational and prudent person to engage him to endeavour their satisfaction) because it were hardly probable that the truth it self could be embraced *on its own account*, and so *for virtuous motives*, whilst these humors were *predominant*; and to receive the truth it self for *vitious ones* were a desecration

and prostitution of it, which must certainly be most odious and detestable in the sight of God, who judges impartially of the *secret thoughts and intentions*, as well as the *exterior professions* of Men; that, I say, these things are true, if *Reason* do not, yet *sad experience* will, prove a full conviction. Besides their receiving the truth it self upon *humor* (and it cannot be judged to be upon any other account where it is not embraced upon a pious sense of its *usefulness*) would both be *scandalous* to those that might perceive it (as Hypocrites cannot always be so cautious in their personations, but that sometimes the *Asses ears* will appear through the *Lyons skin*) and would render them as *uncertain* to any party as the cause that makes it. Nay if, after you had reduced them to this good pliable temper, you could not prevail on them in perswading them to an assent to what you say, either through the *weakness of their understandings*, or *your own unskilfulness* in pleading for a good cause with advantage; yet you must needs conclude them invincibly ignorant, and therefore *excusable* before God in this regard, as well as *positively acceptable* in others; and therefore must be as charitable in your demeanor to them, as you

you believe, God will prove favourable in their final sentence; which must needs be a great secondary satisfaction and comfort (that their errors themselves are innocent) to such as are more intent on the improvement of Christianity it self than any subdiving denomination. For if God himself, though he desires that good Men should attain the *actual truth* in order to the peace of Ecclesiastical Communion, be yet pleased to admit of some anomalous instances of his mercy, whose failing thereof shall not prove prejudicial to them; If, I say, God may *do thus*, and may *be presumed to do so by you*; I do not see how you can excuse your self (if you dissent) from forfeiting the glory of *uniformity* and *resignation* of your will to God, which are they alone which make your other services acceptable, or from incurring the blame of the envious murmuring servant, of having (k) *your own eye evil because your Masters is good.* Nay, for my part, I believe, that if you can here (as you ought to do in all cases) be satisfied in expectation of a future reward from God; your patient and confident acquiescing in the Will of God, even when your endeavours prove successless as to the end immediately designed by your self,

(k) S. Mat. xx. 15.

will be ſo far from being a *diſcouragement*, as that it will indeed intitle you to a greater proportion of ſpiritual comfort; both becauſe you may then beſt *ſatiſie* your ſelf in the integrity of your intention for God when you can readily acquieſce without any gratification of your ſelf by a victory in your diſcourſe; and becauſe the preſent *little* fruits of *your* labours may juſtly encourage you to expect a more plentiful *arrear* behind. Yet, I believe, this preparation of your Auditors for your diſcourſes by a ſenſe of piety will not miniſter much or frequent occaſions of diffidence even of the *event*, nor conſequently of the exerciſe of theſe paſſive Graces, as well in regard of the *Divine aſſiſtance*, you may then hope for, as *your own abilities*. For when the perſon has thus rendred himſelf worthy of the favour, and has implored the Divine goodneſs for its actual collation; there can be no reaſon to deſpair of the *Divine aſſiſtance*, ſo far as it may not violate the ordinary Rules of Providence: ſuch as are the ſuggeſting ſuch motives to your mind as are moſt proper to prevail on the capacity of the perſon with whom you deal; the fitting you with advantage of proper and perſwaſive expreſſion; the ſuiting all to the cir-

circumſtances and apprehenſions of the perſon, and the like, which when they concur, cannot frequently fail of the deſired event. But that which does eſpecially recommend this method, is, that theſe moral diſpoſitions of the will are ſo frequently taken notice of in the Goſpel it ſelf as the qualifications that prepared its Auditors for its reception. For theſe ſeem to be the (l) *opening of the ears*, the (m) *touching of the heart*, the (n) *ſheeplike diſpoſition*, the (o) *preparation for the Kingdom*, the (p) *ordination to eternal life*, the (q) *true Iſraeliteſhip*, which are every where aſſigned as the reaſons of the converſion of many of them. But this, only by the way.

(l) Iſa. xlviii. 8. l. 5.
(m) Acts xvi. 14.
(n) S. Joh. x. 14, 16.
(o) S. Luk. ix. 62.
(p) Acts. xiii. 48.
(q) S. Joh. i. 47.

X. THAT I may therefore return to the ſubject of my former diſcourſe, you may hence conclude, that all that your people are obliged to practiſe, that at leaſt, you are obliged to know; and that not only as a *Practitioner*, who may be ſecure in knowing his own duty, in the ſimplicity of it, with ſuch reaſons alſo of it as may be uſeful for rectifying his intention, which is the only thing that can rationally be conceived to render a duty acceptable to God; but alſo as a *Guide*, who ſhould alſo be acquainted with the nature of the duty it ſelf,

ſelf, and the reaſon why it is impoſed by God, and how it may contribute to the improvement of mankind, and what influence every circumſtance conſiderable may have on the morality of the whole duty. For without theſe things you can never be able to make a true eſtimate of thoſe infinite caſes that may occur, having to deal with perſons of different complexions, and different callings, and different habitual inclinations. Upon which account it will concern you firſt to have ſtudied all thoſe Fundamentals, which are generally eſteemed ſo by perſons of all perſwaſions (ſuch are thoſe contained in the (r) *Creed* commonly aſcribed to the *Apoſtle*) not that I conceive it neceſſary that you deduce all conſequences that may be inferred from expreſſions uſed, even by approved Authors, even in theſe affairs themſelves; but that you may be able, from your own Judgment, to give an account what concerning them is neceſſary to be believed, and for what reaſons, that ſo you may be able to ſatisfie an inquiſitive Laick, and maintain the honour of your place, which is to preſerve the *Keys* of *knowledge* as well as *Diſcipline*; and

(r) That this is the ſenſe of the Church concerning this *Creed*, appears, in that this is required of all perſons to be baptized, in the *Office of Baptiſm*; of all perſons dying, in the *Office of Viſitation of the Sick*; of all perſons thought fit to be confirmed or communicated, in the *Church Catechiſm*.

and believe it, in this knowing age, it is more than ever neceſſary. But for theſe things I would not have you too much truſt the *Schoolmen*, or any modern collectors of *Bodies of Divinity*, who do too frequently confound *Traditions* with *Opinions*, the *Doctrines* and *Inferences of the Church* with her *Hiſtorical Traditions*, the *ſenſe of the ancient* with the *ſuperadditions of modern ages*, and their own *private ſenſes* with thoſe of the *Church*. If therefore you would faithfully and diſtinctly inform your ſelf herein, I do not underſtand how you can do it with ſecurity to your ſelf that you do not miſguide your flock, in affairs of ſo momentous a concernment, without having recourſe to the Originals themſelves; wherein you ſhould cautiouſly diſtinguiſh what is *clearly*, and *in terms*, revealed by the Apoſtles, and what only is ſo *virtually* and *conſequentially*; for it cannot be credible that God has made the belief of that neceſſary to ſalvation, which he has not *clearly revealed* (ſo as to leave the unbelievers unexcuſable) and that cannot rationally be pretended to be clearly revealed, which is neither ſo *in terms*, nor in *clear and certain conſequences*. Now theſe Originals are the *Scriptures* as the

Text,

Text, and the *Fathers of the first and purest Centuries* as an *Historical Commentary*, in controverted passages, to clear its sense. First therefore the reading of the *Scripture* is a duty, in all regards, incumbent on you; For these are they that (s) *are written that we might believe, and that believing we might have life in the name of Christ*; that (t) *are certainly to assure us of those things wherein we have been Catechized*; that are able to make us (u) *wise unto salvation*. And particularly, in reference to your Calling, the Scriptures are said to be necessary for making (x) *the man of God* (an appellative especially proper to the *Clergy*, 1 Tim. vi. 11.) *perfect in teaching, in reproving, in correcting, in discipline* (so παιδεία signifies) acts also peculiarly belonging to the *Clerical Calling*. And accordingly our (y) Church did oblige the *Clergy* to read

(s) Joh. xx. 31.

(t) Luk. i. 4.

(u) 2 Tim. iii. 15.

(x) 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

(y) Also that every Parson, Vicar, Curate, Chantery, Priest, and Stipendary, being under the degree of a Batchelor of Divinity, shall provide and have of his own, within three months after this Visitation, the New Testament both in Latin and English, with the Paraphrase upon the same of Erasmus, and diligently study the same, conferring the one with the other. And the Bishops and other Ordinaries by themselves or their Officers in their Synods and Visitations, shall examine the said Ecclesiastical persons how they have profited in the study of Holy Scripture. Injunct. by K. Edward VI. Anno 1547. Edit. 11. of Dr. Sparrow p. 6, 7.

Also

Also that every Parson, Vicar, Curate, and Stipendary Priest, being under the Degree of a Master of Art, shall provide and have of his own within three months after this Visitation, the New Testament both in Latin and English with Paraphrases upon the same, conferring the one with the other. And the Bishops and other Ordinaries by themselves or their Officers, in their Synods and Visitations, shall examine the said Ecclesiastical persons how they have profited in the study of Holy Scripture. Injunct. by Q. Elizabeth, Anno, 1559. p. 72. r. 16.

I shall read daily at the least one chapter of the old Testament, and another of the new, with good advisement, to the increase of my knowledge. Protestation to be made, promised and subscribed by persons to be admitted to any Office, Room or Cure, or other place Ecclesiastical, among the Articles of Q. Elizabeth, Anno, 1564. p. 127.

two Chapters, at least, every day, concerning which, according to the old rules, they might have been examined by the *Bishop*, as also in *Erasmus*'s *Paraphrase*; which seems to have been Instituted to make amends for the length of the *Roman Offices* (injoyned by them on their Clergy under pain of mortal sin) above that of our *Liturgy*; as conceiving the skill of the Clergy in the *Scriptures* of more moment for the discharge of their duty to the publick than their *prayers* themselves. Besides your skill herein is looked on as so necessary as that it is one of the severest charges laid on all in the very collati-

on

on of their Orders, that they be (z) diligent in reading the *Scriptures*.

(z) In the Offices for all the three Orders.

XI. XI. BUT you must not think this charge satisfied in beginning to do so from the time of your *Ordination*. For you must remember that you are then to be a *Teacher*, not a *Scholar*; besides that you cannot pass a prudent judgment of your own abilities till you have already experienced them, and therefore must have begun before. As you therefore read the Scriptures, it were well that after reading of any Chapter you would mark the difficult places, at least in the *New Testament*, and, when they may seem to concern any necessary matter of Faith or Practice (for you must remember that I am now speaking of the meanest qualifications that may be expected in him who would prudently take this calling on him) afterwards consult *Commentators*, such as are reputed most excellent in their kind; and read them not *cursorily*, but *carefully*, examining their grounds to the uttermost of your capacity, seeing that you are to enquire, not only for your self, but also for as many as are to be led by you. First therefore, after you have read the *Commentator*, either in *writing*, or, if that be too tedious in

in *meditation*, recollect the ſum of his diſcourſe, by reducing them to *Propoſitions*; then apply the proofs to the Propoſitions they properly belong to. Then examine the pertinency of his proofs ſo applyed; if they be *Reaſons*, from the nature of the thing; if *Teſtimonies*, from the Authors from whom he borrows them, by which means alone you may underſtand whether they mean them in the ſenſe intended by him. And at laſt ſee how his ſenſe agrees with the Text it ſelf, by comparing it with the *cohærence*, both *antecedent*, and *conſequent*. And for this occaſional uſe of expounding Scripture, it were neceſſary to be skilled in the *Originals*; for all *Tranſlations* being performed by fallible perſons, and being capable of ſuch æquivocations which may frequently have no ground in the Originals; the ſenſe, as collected from ſuch Tranſlations, may very probably be miſunderſtood, and therefore cannot be ſecurely truſted. But, of the two Originals, the *Greek* is that, which can with leſs ſecurity be neglected upon the principles already premiſed. For, ſuppoſing that your obligation is chiefly for *matters of Faith*, and ſo tranſcending natural means of knowledge; and *moral duties*, not evident, nor deducible, from the light of *right Reaſon*,

Reason, as being special degrees, peculiarly due to those manifestations of the Divine love in the Gospel, greater than could have been expected from the *Divine Philanthropy*, as it appears from reason alone; both of these are proper to the *Gospel state*, and therefore are only to be expected from the *New Testament*, which, though in other things it may require the *Hebrews*, for understanding the *Hellenistical stile*; yet in these things, being so peculiarly proper to the Gospel-state, and being many of them meerly *new Revelations*, it cannot be so extreamly necessary, and therefore the *Greek* may be here sufficient. Yet I must withal needs confess, that (for the *Government* and *Governors of the Church*, and *the rituals* adopted into Christianity by the *positive Institution* of the Gospel, the *two Sacraments* and other Solemnities of the Service of God) the knowledge of the *Jewish Antiquities* is very necessary for clearing some things of so momentous a consideration, and so ordinary practice, as that you may not be able, without them, to give a full satisfaction to your Parochial cure, in doubts that may nearly concern them, which will therefore require a skill in the *Rabbins*, if not in the *Hebrew Tongue* wherein they are written. And yet even here

here, considering the *fabulousness* and *suspiciousness* of these *Rabbinical* Records in any thing *Historical*, I should be much better satisfied with any information from those more *certainly antient* Authors, which are extant in other Tongues, such as *Philo* and *Josephus* &c. and indeed shall not credit the *Rabbins* any farther than as they agree with such *better attested* Monuments, or with the *nature* of the things attested by them.

XII. And upon the same account, I do not, for my part, see how you can well have neglected *the Fathers of the first and purest Centuries*, especially those that are, by the consent of all, concluded genuine, and that lived before the Empire turned Christian, who consequently were free from those secular enjoyments, which, in a short time, sensibly corrupted that generosity and exemplary severity, which were so admirably conspicuous in the infancy of Christianity. For, though it be confessed that the *Scriptures* are indeed clear in all matters indispensably necessary to Salvation (which are the only subjects of my present discourse) yet I conceive that perspicuity to have been mainly accommodated to the present apprehensions of the persons then living, many of the phrases XII.

being taken from doctrines or practices then generally prevailing among them, and obviously notorious to all, the vulgar, as well as persons of greater capacities. But that all things, that were then clear, might not, as other Antiquities have done since, in a long process of time, contract an accidental obscurity by the *abolition*, or *neglect*, of those then notorious *Antiquities*, on which that perspicuity is supposed to depend; or that, supposing this perspicuity still to depend on such Antiquities, Providence should have been obliged to keep such Antiquities themselves unchanged, or any other way notorious than by the monuments still extant of those ages; cannot, I conceive, with any probability be presumed: either from the nature of the thing; or the design of the Scriptures, which both seem to have been written in accomodation to particular exigencies, and on particular occasions; and rather to intimate, than insist on, such things as were already presumed notorious, and must needs have been either more intricate, if brief; or more tedious and voluminous, if accurate, in explaining so numerous particulars. Now, if this perspicuity were accommodated to the apprehensions of them to whom they were, more immediately, revealed;

vealed; then certainly the Holy Ghost must needs be presumed to have intended such senses as he knew them ready and likely to apprehend (epescially in such cases wherein the terms were taken from something already notorious among them, and wherein they could have no reason to suspect their misapprehensions, much less, ordinary means to rectifie them) and therefore, on the contrary, what we can find to have been their sense of the Scriptures, in things perspicuous and necessary, that we have reason to believe verily intended by the Revealer. Besides that this is the usual practice of our most accurate Critics, to expound their Authors, where difficult, by comparing them with other writers of the same time, or Sect, or Subject, which mention the thing doubted of more clearly; and therefore cannot prudently be refused here, where we are speaking of the ordinary moral means of finding out the true sense of the Scriptures. I do confess that the Fathers do not write in a method so accurate and fitted to the capacities of beginners as our modern *Systemes*, but withal, I think, it cannot be denyed but that they are, even upon that account, more intelligible than the Scriptures, so that they who are obliged to be skilful in the Scrip-

tures cannot, upon any account, be presumed uncapable of understanding the Fathers. Nor ought it to be pretended that the writings of the Fathers are too voluminous and tedious a task for a young Man to undertake before his entring into the Clerical calling; for both I do not see how that way can be counted tedious, which is necessary, and only secure, how long soever it may be; nor is it indeed true, that the Fathers of the first three Centuries were a task so very tedious (for as for others afterwards, the more remote they are, the less competent also they must be for informing us of the sense of the Apostles in an *Historical way*, of which alone we are now discoursing; nay seeing that the later writers can know nothing this way, but what has been delivered to them by the former, it will follow that they cannot be able to inform us of any thing new, after the reading of their predecessors, and therefore, though it might be *convenient*, yet, after the Primitives, the reading of the later Fathers cannot be so *indispensably necessary*) especially if the counterfeited Authors and Writers be excepted, together with all those that are lyable to any just suspicion, and are reputed such by learned and candid men; and if their time were improved,

improved, as it might by most, and would by all, that would undertake this severe Calling upon these conscientious accounts I have been already describing. Besides I do not know why they should complain for want of time either *before*, or *after*, the susception of Holy Orders, when as we see other Callings require seven years learning before their liberty to practise, whereas a much less time well improved would serve for this, even for ordinary capacities, that were grounded in the necessary rudiments of humane learning; and they have afterwards a maintenance provided for them without care, that they might addict themselves without distraction to employments of this nature. All things therefore being considered, I do not see how this requisite (how much soever it may amuse some by its seeming novelty) is either *unnecessary* or *unpracticable*.

XIII. Besides these reasons from *necessity*, I might produce others of *convenience* why young practitioners of Divinity should deduce their doctrine more immediately from the fountains. As first, that by this means they may be best able to judge impartially, when they are less possessed with the favour of a party; whereas it is, I doubt, too frequently, the pra- XIII.

ctice of those that no otherwise, first espouse a party, afterwards to see with no other perspectives than what prejudice and interest will permit, not so much to enquire what does indeed appear truly derived from the Apostles, as what these conveighers of Apostolical Tradition say in favour of their own, and discountenance of their Adversaries faction. And secondly, this would certainly much contribute to the infusing a peaceable Spirit into the Catholick Church (a blessing vigorous to be prosecuted and prayed for by all good Christians) which certainly could not chuse but considerably contribute further to the actual peace of Christendom, whose principles might undoubtedly in many things be better accommodated, if their Spirits were less exasperated. This it would do partly by the inevidence of the reasons, when examined; for it is generally the unexperienced confidence that is most bold and daring: partly in deriving principles of accommodation from those fountains which all do so unanimously applaud, and wherein therefore they are most likely to agree, if ever Providence reduce them to a reconciliation: and partly because by this means they will be less likely to broach any offensive Doctrines, seeing that for this

end

end, not only the Church of *Rome*, but our Mother the Church of *England*, (*a*) has required that no other Expositions of Scriptures be urged publickly but such as are agreeable to the Doctrine of the Fathers: your observation of which Canon I do not see how you can secure without knowing what they hold, nor know what they hold without reading them. Besides Thirdly, that the very conversing with such admirable monuments of Piety, where most of their very errors seem to have proceeded from a nobly designing excessive severity, and their practices rather exceeded, than fell short of, their doctrinal severity, must needs, like the conversation of God with *Moses* in the *Mount*, affect them with a proportionable splendor: to see them devoting all their wordly interests for the Service of the Church, exposing their lives and fortunes for the faith of Christ, I do not say, willingly and patiently, but even joyfully and triumphantly, (*b*) wearying their Judges cruelty, and blunting their Executioners Axes, with the multitudes of such as, without any enquiry, offered themselves, crouding and thronging to the *Catastæ*, the *Ungulæ*, the stakes and grid-irons,

(*a*) Inprimis videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro Concione quod a populo religiose teneri & credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti quodque ex illâ ipsâ Doctrinâ *Catholici Patres & veteres Episcopi* collegerint. *Lib. quorund. Canon. An.* 1571. *Ed. H. D.* Sparrow p. 238.

(b *Tert* vl. ad *Sca* [illegible]

irons, and other the most terrible executions that were ever heard of, with as much earnestness and emulation as was ever shewn in the Olympick exercises, impatiently striving for the honour of that which the World thought penal and calamitous. And lastly that they must needs from hence make a truer estimate concerning the real design and duties of Christianity, from those times wherein it was undertaken upon choice and a rational approbation, and against all the contrary aversations of worldly interests, meerly for its own sake; and when it was preached in the simplicity of it, without any *compliances* and *indulgences* gratifying either the humors or pretended necessities of a worldly conversation; than now when fashion and education and worldly interests are the very inducements inclining many to profess themselves Christians, who otherwise take not the least care of fulfilling their baptismal obligations, and wherein the vitious reserves of the World have prevailed so far as to corrupt their very *Casuistical Divinity*, and to make them believe those things impossible, and so necessarily requiring the Divine favour to excuse them, which yet were then universally performed. And to see how peculiarly the *Clerical Calling* was then honoured;

noured: that none were chosen to it but either such as were designed by the more immediate inspiration of the (c) Holy Ghost to their Ordainer; or by the general Suffrages of (d) People concerning their unspotted lives, when that extraordinary way failed; or by some extraordinary experiment of their excellent Spirits: such were (e) renouncing all their possessions, and resigning them to the common use of the Church, or some (f) exemplary suffering for the faith of *Christ* (which though not extending to death was then called (g) *Martyrdom*) besides that zeal and incessant diligence in providing for the necessities of their cure, and those persecutions which were sometimes as peculiarly their lot as they were Gods, must needs imprint a Sacred Awe and Reverence for the Calling, which if measured by present either precepts or precedents, cannot be deservedly esteemed.

(c) Dr. *Hammond* on i. Tim. 1. 18. (d) *Lamprid* in *Alexan. severo* & ibid. *Casuab. S. Cyprian.* Ep. 34. (e) So *S.* Cyprian. *Pont.* in vit. *Cyprian.* (f) So S. *Aurelius* S. Cyprian Ep. 33. *Celerinus* Id. Ep. 34. *Numidicus* Ep. 35. (g) Vid. Pamel. in Ep. 9. S. *Cyprian* & *B.* Rhena. & alios ad *Tertul.* ad Martyr.

XIV. But to proceed. Besides this knowledge of the prime necessary fundamentals it will also be necessary for to be skilled in all such controversies *as separate any considerable Communions of Christians.* For these also your flock, illiterate as well as learned, are obliged to practise. For it is certain that they must be obliged to make

make use of the Sacraments as the ordinary channels where Grace may be expected, and therefore must communicate with some *Church*, and seeing every Church does not only assert its own, but censure other Communions differing from her, and therefore will not permit any person that enjoys her Communion to Communicate with any other; it will follow that they must all be concerned, as far as they are capable, to understand a reason, not only of their Communion with ours, but their consequent separation from other Churches. For seeing *Schism* is a sin of as malignant an influence to Souls as many others which are more infamous in the Vulgar account; it must needs be your duty to secure them from that, as well as other sins. Now the formal imputable notion of *Schism* as a sin being the *no necessity* of its dividing the Churches Peace; that any party of Men may be excusable from it, they must be satisfied: either that not they, but their Adversaries, were the causes of the division; or that, if themselves were, yet it was on their part necessary; which it is impossible for you to do even to your own prudent satisfaction, if you do not understand the true state of the Controversies, and the full force of what is produced on both sides. And for know-

See the *Preface* to my Discourse of Schism §. 9. and the Discourse it self.

knowing the true state of the Controversies, you must remember, that the Obligation incumbent on you for knowing them does not concern you as they are the *disputes of private Doctors*, or *even tolerated Parties*, but as they are the *Characteristicks of Communions*; and therefore they must be the *Councils and Canons*, or such other public Authentick Records of the Churches, or their acknowledged Champions as explaining their *Churches sense*, and not their *own*, and the conditions practised among them without which their Communion cannot be had, in which you must be presumed skilful. I do not think it so indispensably necessary that you be skilled in all the particular Controversies of meaner concernment, even betwixt different Churches themselves, but those that are mutually thought sufficient to *separate Communion*; nor in all those themselves, but in any. For as, for joyning in a Communion, it is necessary that all the Conditions prescribed for it be lawful; so on the contrary, if only one be unlawful, it is enough to prove the separation *not unnecessary*, and so *not culpable*, nay, that it is *necessary* and *obligatory*; and so sufficient to satisfie him in as much as he is concerned to practise. Your skill in these things

will

will every way be obligatory on you: for their sakes that are capable, that you may *satisfie them*; for those who are not, that you may *secure them*, (who, by how much they are less able to help themselves, must consequntly more rely upon your conduct, which will therefore lay the blame of their miscarriages heavily on you, if they be occasioned by your negligence) and for the reducing such as are misled, a duty too generally neglected among the poor superstitious *Natives*, though expresly required by the (*h*) Canons of our Church; so that you are obliged, not only to be able to teach your Flock, but also (*i*) *to resist gainsayers*, *to* (*k*) *rebuke them with all authority*, (*l*) *to stop their mouths*, to convince and perswade the *modest*, and to confound and shame the *Incorrigible*. But, in dealing with Adversaries, it were fit, that, in accommodation to the method already prescribed, of fitting them for rational discourses by first bringing them to a conscientious sense of their duty; you would therefore fit your motives to those preparations, by insisting not only on the *Truth*, but the *Piety*, of embracing what you would perswade them to, and the *Impiety* of the contrary; how *directly*, or *indirectly*, it countenances or encourages licentiousness;

(*h*) Can. of the Church of *Ireland*. xl.
(*i*) Tit. i.
(*k*) Tit. ii.
(*l*) Tit. i. ii.

ouſneſs; at leaſt of how miſchievous conſequence the ſin of *Schiſm* upon ſuch an account would be, and how inconſiderable the contrary palliations are for excuſing it: that *Schiſm* is *a breach of Peace*, and ſo a violation of the very Teſtament of our Lord; *of love*, and ſo diſowning the Characteriſtick bage whereby Chriſtians are peculiarly diſtinguiſhable from the Infidel-world; *a ſubdividing the Church into Factions and Parties*, and consequently chargeable with the guilt of the ſcandal of the common Adverſaries, who by theſe means are induced to diſhonourable thoughts of the Inſtitutor of ſo divided a Profeſſion, and are by theſe mutual exaſperations enabled to ſee the infirmities of all Parties by their mutual recriminations; and ſo their minds become exulcerated and impregnably prejudiced againſt all the Rhetorick of the Goſpel, and uncapable of thoſe ends deſigned by God in its publication (and oh how heavy an account will ſuch diſhonour of God, ſuch fruſtrating of his Evangelical deſigns, and the miſcarriage of ſuch a multitude of Souls, ſo dearly purchaſed by him, amount to!) beſides the internal miſchiefs following from it: *a weakning the common ſtrength* by diſperſing it into multitudes of inconſiderable fracti-

ons,

ons, singly considered, and so disabling it for any generous designs of taking care of that great part of the World which never yet heard of the Gospel, besides *the dissolution of Discipline, the contempt of the Authority, and weakned it, and so the great liberty made for all the vices and scandals of wicked men by a consquent impunity.* I would heartily recommend this consideration to our conscientious dissenting Brethren who are affrighted from our Communion by the scandalous lives of some of our pretended *Conformists*, how much themselves contribute to the Calamities they so seriously deplore, by bringing a disrespect on that Authority which should, if entertained with due veneration, either reform them, or make them cease to be scandalous by their perfect exclusion from her Communion.

XV. XV. BUT that which you can least of all want, is a study *too much neglected*, because *too little experienced*, among *Protestants*, that of *Casuistical Divinity*. For unless your *general Sermons* be brought home and applyed to *particular Consciences*; I do not know how you can be said to have used your utmost diligence for the Salvation of particular persons, and therefore how you can clear your self from particular mis-

miscarriages. I am sure, this is the way the Apostle St. *Paul* vindicates himself *from the blood of all men.* Act. xx. 26. that he had *not spared to declare unto them the whole counsel of God*, v. 26. and that, not only, publickly, but also, *from house to house* v. 29. nay that *for three years, night and day, he ceased not to warn every one with tears*; which expressions do certainly denote a greater frequency than that of their publick Synaxes, where their Preaching was in use; besides that the words εἷς ἕκαστος, used for every one, cannot be understood of them *Collectively*, but *Distributively* and *singly*. There is a remarkable saying quoted by *Clemens* (*m*) *Alexandrinus* from an ancient *Apocryphal* work: "That "the companion of a good man can "hardly perish without involving "the good man himself in a partici-"pation of the blame; which is certainly, in more sever esense, verifiable of a person engaged in the *Clerical Calling*, because of the charge with which they are peculiarly intrusted. The charge it self you may read in *Ezech.* xxxiii. (a passage I conceive very well worthy some serious thoughts before you undertake Orders) if the destruction come, and take away any

(*m*) Ἐὰν ἑκλεκτὸς γείτων ἁμαρτήσῃ, ἥμαρτεν ὁ ἔκλεκτος· εἰ γὰρ ὅτως ἑαυτὸν ἦγεν ὡς ὁ λόγος ὑπαγορεύει, κατηδέσθη ἂν αὐτῷ τὸν βίον καὶ ὁ γείτων εἰς τὸ μὴ ἁμαρτεῖν. Tradit. sub nomine S. *Matthiæ Apostol.* apud *Clem. Alex.* Strom. vii. p. 537. Edit. *Lugd. Bat.* 1616.

any of your charge, whosoever he be, dyes in his sins; but you, if you have warned him, are responsible for him. N I do not see how you can be said to h warned him, when you have not taken pains to inform your self of his conditi For, considering that you are not now expect *Revelations*, but to judge *a posterio* by the appearances and ordinary course things; you cannot warn any of dan but such as appear in a state of Dem to whom God has threatned it, and th how culpable it is, cannot be judg without examination of particular circu stances. For do not believe that the *Pulp denunciation* of judgments can suffice, that it can reach the end of these war ings, the terrifying men from their sin so as not only to make them entertai some *struggling velleities* against them but also to endeavour an *effectual reli quishment* of them. For either they a *Indefinite* and *Hypothetical*, involving in deed all sinners in the danger, bu not telling who are such, so that th *Application* (which is of the most effectu al influence for the reduction of any *parti cular person*) is left entirely to the too-par tially-affected disposition of the perso himself (whose very judgment being eithe

diverted

perverted or *depraved* by his vices, so that he is *unwilling* or *unable* to discern them to be so, and his very conscience by that means either *actually* or *habitually* seared) he can be never likely to condemn himself, unless he be reduced by a particular consideration of his own, for which he is not beholding to the *Ministery*; or they are so managed as that indeed no man can have reason upon that account to be particularly terrified. For considering that those denunciations that are *general* do concern those remainders of sin which are in the most pious Persons, as long-lived as themselves; and accordingly that the *Public confessions of sins*, wherein the *pious* as well as the *impious* are concerned to joyn, and that without dissimulation or falshood, do such as are confessed, in the very same terms, to deserve the penalties so denounced, and yet it is most certain that *no condemnation does belong to them*; nay, though they constantly commit the like sins, and therefore periodically have need of reiterating the same *Confessions*, as not being encouraged to believe it possible to relinquish all such sins, but only to strive against them; by this means persons are accustomed to confess themselves *sinners*, nay, and great ones too, and to deserve the

severest of these *Comminations*, and yet all this without any terror, supposing all this to be common to them with the Holyest Men living, to whom undoubtedly no terror does belong; These things, I say, being considered, they cannot hereby be obliged to believe themselves actually in danger of these threats, and therefore cannot, for fear of them, be obliged to relinquish utterly their endangering demerits. I doubt many a poor Soul does feel this experimentally, who, though they have lived for many years under a terrible Ministery, yet never have been thereby actually terrified from those vices to which themselves acknowledge the curse of God to be due, especially if they were secret, and so might escape the censures and particular reproofs of Men. Besides that by this means of only *Pulpit reproofs* you cannot pretend to say that you have warned such persons as either through *Irreligion*, or *Prophaneness*, or *contrary perswasions* (occasions too frequent now a days, and comprehending multitudes of Souls) forbear the Church, or consequently clear your self from being accountable for them. But, though in publick Preaching, sins were particularized more than they are, and charged with that peculiar severity they

they deſerve; yet you muſt remember that they are very few that can prudently be ſo dealt with: *ſuch as generally prevailed, and ſuch as were notorious*; ſo that for all others that are not reducible to theſe heads (many of which may prove of as dangerous conſequence to the concerned perſons themſelves as theſe, if they perſiſt in them) I do not ſee how you can chuſe but be Reſponſible, if you do not reprove them by a more cloſe and particular addreſs.

XVI. I know the degeneration of our preſent Age is ſo univerſal herein, and that Men are naturally ſo diſingenuous, as that rather than they will acknowledge themſelves faulty, they will ſtrain their wits for Palliations and Apologies, eſpecially when countenanced by the practice of Men of an otherwiſe ſevere converſation; that you may not admire if you may find ſome who may conceive me ſevere in this point. But you muſt remember the liberty I have deſigned in this whole diſcourſe, not to flatter any one in affairs of ſo hazardous conſequence; and I do not doubt but that even thoſe my opponents themſelves will believe this way, though more ſevere, yet certainly, more excellent and more ſecure, and therefore though it were XVI.

only *doubtful*, yet it were *more conveniently practicable*. But for my part, I think it so little doubtful, as that, laying aside that unwillingness that either *interest*, or *the surprisal of a Novelty*, may create in many against its reception; I think there can be little pretended that may cause a rational scruple to an unprejudiced understanding person. For if a general denunciation of Gods anger against impenitents had been sufficient, and no more particular application had been necessary to have been made than what had been the result of the guilty Consciences, or the good natures, of the persons themselves, or the peculiar providential preventions of God; I do not see what necessity there had been of the *Prophets*, as Watchmen, of old; or of *Preachers* now. *For that God is a rewarder and punisher of the actions of wicked men*, none ever yet denyed that held a Providence much less such as owned any written Revelations, which were able more distinctly to inform them what these rewards were; and we know it is the reply of *Abraham* to *Dives*, that if *Moses* and the *Prophets* were not able to assure them of the certainty of these future rewards on supposition of their impenitency, neither would they be convinced though a Preacher were sent

S. Luke xvi. 31.

ſent them *from the Dead*, ſo that upon this account the ſending of Prophets muſt have been needleſs, eſpecially of ſuch as were diſtinct from the penmen of the Canonical Books, and were ſent on proviſional meſſages, for concerning ſuch alone I am at preſent diſcourſing. Beſides the credibility of theſe rewards depended on the credit of the *Law* it ſelf, which was antecedent to the miſſion of *Prophets*, as being, that by which they were to be *tryed*, and therefore could not in any competent way be proved by their Teſtimony; which will appear the rather credible when it is remembred that temporal calamities were the uſual ſubjects of theſe ordinary Prophetick meſſages. The only thing therefore that they muſt have been ſent for muſt have been a *particular application* to the parties concerned. And accordingly this is their method ſtill to deliver their meſſage to the perſons themſelves: when to the *People*, as it was moſt frequently, in their *publick Aſſemblies*; when to their *Princes*, or to other *particular private Perſons*, ſtill their practice was accordingly. Nor did they ever excuſe themſelves (as too many are apt to do now) when perſons apprehended themſelves particularly concerned, by pretending that the application

was none of theirs; but still they owned it, and were ready to suffer the inflictions of those whom they had thus exasperated. And accordingly we find it reckoned among the principal qualifications of a *Prophet* even by the *Jews* themselves, that he be, not only *wise*, and *rich*, but also *valiant*. And *Jeremy* is thus encouraged to *harden his face like brass*, and that he be against the *Jews* like (n) *an impregnable fortress*, that he should not (o) *fear their faces* neither (p) *be dismayed*; and *Esay*, as a Type of our Saviour, hardens his *face like flint*, Isa. l. 7. which I do not know of what peculiar use it could prove in this case, unless it were to embolden them that they might not fear the threats or malice of the great ones in the performance of their duty, which they had not been in such danger of without this application. Besides if this application were not the peculiar employment of an ordinary Prophet, I do not understand what it was that was blamed in the *false Prophets*, who (q) *Preached Peace when there was no Peace*. For that ever any of them was so impudent as to deny the truth of Gods denunciations against sinners indefinitely is no way credible; or that doing so, they could find credit in a Nation so signally convinced

(n) Jer. i. 18. vi. 27. xv. 20.
(o) v. 8.
(p) v. 7.
(q) Jer. vi. 14. viii. 11.

ced of a Providence. Their crime therefore must have been, that they flattered the wicked, and either made them believe their faults to be none at all, or not so great as indeed they were; or that God would either *excuse* them *particularly*, or not *punish them in this life*, or *not suddenly*, or *not severely*. And accordingly also in the New Testament we find (*r*) S. *Stephen* and the (*s*) *Apostles* charging their crimes home on their Persecutors; and to this end endued with an admirable (*t*) ἀποφθεγγία, among other gifts of the Holy Ghost then dispensed for capacitating them for their Office. And that this particular application was not grounded on such particular Revelations whereby those extraordinary persons might have been enabled to judge particularly of their cases, for which we, who have none but human fallible means of knowing the wickedness of mens hearts, may now be thought less sufficient; may appear from the frequent mention of this use of particular reproof as an (*u*) ordinary qualification for the *Clerical Calling*, and from the like practise of the most antient Fathers and Martyrs, who every where (*x*) freely inveigh against *Crescens* a *Cynick* Philosopher, and the *Romans* *Tertullian* and *Scap*, & *Apol.* *S. Cyprian* ad *Demetrian*, &c.

(*r*) Act. vii 51, 52.
(*s*) Act. ii. 36. iii. 13, 14, 15. iv. 10. xii. 10, 11.
(*t*) Act. iv. 13. 29. xiii. 46. vid. num. xix.
(*u*) 2 Tim. iv. 2. Tit. ii. 15. and
(*x*) S. *Justin. Martyr* Apol. and

against the particular scandalous persons of their times, and their persecutors. But these things are in themselves obvious, and are a subject too copious to be insisted on at present.

XVII. XVII. SUPPOSING therefore this necessity of a particular application, it will be easie to deduce hence the necessity of your skill in *Casuistical Divinity*. For if you must particularly apply, you must particularly know the state of the *Conscience* you have to deal with. And that you may judge it when known, you must know *the means of acquiring all virtues, and of avoiding all vices and sins, and the stress of all Laws, and the influences of all Circumstances considerable, and the way of dealing with all tempers*; that you may never judge rashly, that you may advise pertinently and successfully, that you may so provide for the present as that you may foresee dangerous consequences, that you may not run Consciences on perplexities by making one duty inconsistent with another; all which do some way or other belong to *Casuistical Divinity*. Especially it will concern you to be some way skilled in all Laws more immediately relating to *Conscience: the Law of nature*, and the *Positive Laws of God* and the *Church*, which are

are to be your Rules in affairs of this nature. And, because the *Law of nature* intirely, and all other Laws as to their particular influences and applications to particular Cases, as indeed also all *useful humane learning*, do some way depend on the accurateness of your *method of Reasoning*; therefore here it were convenient that you be provided with those requisites for ordering it which are mentioned in my *Letter of Advice for Studies*. For without this your inferences will be lame and imperfect, and not secure to be relied on by a person in your dangerous condition.

XVIII. BUT, besides these qualifications of knowledge, for informing people concerning their duty, there are also other practical requisites for inducing them to the observation of it. Such are *an experience and prudence in the* Ars voluntatis (as Nierembergius *calls it*) *an undaunted courage and confidence in enduring all difficulties that may, and undoubtedly will, occur in the performance of your duty; a sweet and sociable behaviour that may win, yet grave and serious that may awe, the hearts of men*; but above all, even for the sake of your Cure, as well as your own, *a holy and exemplary life*. Of these in their Order. First therefore your first qualification of skill in the XVIII.

Ars

(y) Mat. iv. 19. Mark. i. 17. 2 Cor. xii. 16.

Ars voluntatis, the Art of (y) catching men that I may ſpeak in the language of our Saviour, and S. *Paul*, will require both *experience* in the nature of theſe mental diſeaſes, for your *information*; and *prudence* in the *application* of their cure; for without theſe you can with as little rational confidence venture on their cure as the *Phyſician* that were neither skilled in *Symptoms* of *Diſeaſes* or the *Virtues of Herbs* and *Minerals* which are their uſual remedies; and were as reſponſible for their miſcarriage under your hands as the law makes *Empiricks* and *unskilful perſons*. For underſtanding the nature of theſe mental diſeaſes, you muſt remember that as *virtue* is the *improvement*, ſo, *vice* is the *debauching* of the rational faculties, and therefore you cannot expect to prevail on mens intereſts, and inclinations by a bare repreſentment of the unreaſonableneſs of their actions; for it is clear that *Reaſon* is no meaſure of the actions of *Brutes*; and therefore whilſt Men live not above the *Brutal principle*, that which is *animal* and *ſenſual*; Reaſon is as little valued by them as the richeſt Indian Gems by the *Dunghill Cock* in *Æſop*. So that indeed your work muſt be firſt to make them reaſonable before you propound your reaſons to them; and it

it is half done when you have made them capable of hearing reason. Whilst therefore they are unreasonable, you must deal with them as we do with *children* (it is a similitude excellently urged and illustrated to this purpose by (z) *Maimonides*) first allure them by motives proportioned to their present capacities, to perform the *material actions* of virtue, till by use they be confirmed into a *habit*, which when it is *well rooted*, it will then be easie by shewing the rational advantage of them (which they will then be capable of understanding and perceiving) both to endear their duty, and rectifie their intentions, and so to make them *formally virtuous*. And the prudent managements of this affair are the *wisdom* mentioned by (a) *Socrates*, the (b) *wise charming* in the *Psalmist*, the (c) *Serpentine wisdom* commended by our *Saviour*, the *craft* and *catching with guile* mentioned by (d) St. *Paul*. Now for this it will be necessary, in point of *experience*, that you be acquainted with those difficulties in your self (for thus our *Saviour* himself is observed, by the *Author to the Hebrews*, by his (e) *fellow feeling of our infirmities*, to be qualified for his being *a merciful High Priest*, and being *able to succour them that are tempted*) "and in others "both

(z) *Pert Mosis* Edit. *Oxoniens.* 1655 p. 38. 139, 140, &c.

(a) apud *Platon.* in *Phæd.*

(b) Ps. lviii. 5.

(c) S. Mat. x. 16.

(d) 1 Cor. xii. 16.

(e) Heb. ii. 17, 18.

" both as to their tempers, and habitual
" inclinations, and callings, and daily con-
" versations, and the temptations likely to
" occur: to know the material virtues they
" are inclined to, and to lay hold on the
" *mollia tempora fandi*, their good humors,
" and lucid intervals, and Providential im-
" pulses. For without these things you
cannot know either how to win them, or
how to keep them, and secure them from
Apostasy especially if of a fickle and vari-
able humor, as most men are in their spi-
ritual resolutions. Besides *Prudence* will
be necessary as to all its requisites: *Circum-
spection*, to discern the whole case as to all
the *Precepts* and *Prohibitions* to which the
Action may be obnoxious; all the *Incli-
nations*, and those many times very diffe-
rent, if not contrary, in the same persons;
all the *circumstances* accusing or excusing,
of which allowance is to be had; *Cauti-
on*, in a foresight of all dangers, which up-
on the aforesaid considerations may be pro-
bably expected, and in allowing for future
probable contingencies: *Judgment*, in ac-
commodating the *Laws*, and the *Actions*,
and the *Inclinations* of the Patient in a
due proportion, and providing for their
seemingly contradictous necessities.

XIX. So

XIX. SO also, that *Boldness* and *Courage* is another qualification for this purpose, seems clear, not only from the Old Testament passages intimated formerly concerning Prophets, but also, from the New Testament where it is usually mentioned as a χάρισμα of the Spirit that was to fit them for the discharge of their *Clerical Calling*. Thus the *confidence* of St. *Peter* and St. *John* was admired by the *Sadducees* Act. iv. 13. which is intimated to have proceeded from the *Spirit*. v. 8. and accordingly this was also prayed for for the future v. 29. And this is also observed concerning St. *Paul* after his addresses to the exercise of his office, that he was *Strengthened in his disputations with the Jews*, Act. ix. 22, which is Paraphrased by his *speaking boldly in the name of Jesus* v. 27. And this I conceive to be that (*f*) *Preaching with Authority* mentioned concerning our *Saviour*; and that (*g*) *Preaching with Power, in evidence and demonstration of the Spirit*, concerning the *Apostles*. And indeed without this you can never expect to be able to undergo the difficulties you must engage in, in the performance of your duty. For how can you tell the great ones of their scandalous Sins, or reprove gainsayers, or shame the guilty, or destroy the

XIX.

(*f*) Mat. vii. 29. Mark. i. 22 Luk. iv. 32.
(*g*) 1 Cor. ii. 4.

the confederacies of the Wicked, without exasperating many vitiously disposed minds against you? And if you fear shame, or the spoiling of your goods, or the pain of your body, or death it self; you must needs fear those in whose Power it is to inflict them on you; and if you do so, then, considering that they are so fondly enamoured of those things that tend to their ruin as that they bear their deprivation with impatience, and, like mad-men, prosecute their benefactors with detractions and hostilities (so little sensible they are of the kindness done them, in dissuading and restraining them from them) you can never, upon these terms, be able to rescue them from their danger. This is a qualification, though now extremely neglected, of so very momentous consequence, as that I shall beseech you to be tender of it, for your *Flocks* sake, if not for your *own*. For, believe it, their everlasting welfare depends more nearly on the fidelity of your admonition; and it is to little purpose for you to keep the *watch* if you do not give *warning* at the approach of danger; or, with the *Dog*, to *observe* the flock, if you do not *bark* when the Wolf is ready to devour them. Let not therefore the pretence of youthful modesty,

ſty, or the danger of petulancy or unmanneriness, or the accuſation of incivility, or a ſlaviſh compliance with the ceremonies of the World, or whatever other pretences may be produced by ſuch as are either willing to Apologize for their neglect in this kind, or are conſcious of ſomething in themſelves that may deſerve the exerciſe of this dreaded ſeverity (as men are generally too ingenious in palliating the occaſions of their own ruin) rob you of a jewel wherein the ſecurity of ſo many Souls is ſo nearly concerned. You may, I believe, think it difficult, how to bring your ſelf to it, and when you have it, how to beware of offending on the oppoſite extreme, of being petulent and impertinent, and rendring your ſelf unſociable. For acquiring it I ſhould adviſe you to take care of ſpending your *Tyrocinium* under the wings of a *Patron*, at leaſt ſuch a one as would be offended with your *Freedom*; but rather in a management of an inferior little *Family*, 1 *Tim.* iii. 4, 5. And this may ſerve for acquiring an habit of confidence. But then for the reaſon of it, if I may take you for the perſon the former qualifications have ſuppoſed you to be, you cannot be unprovided: for he who values not any *Worldly enjoyment* as great,

great, can never be awed by any world
Pomp; and he that undervalues even *de*
it self, the King of Terrors, can never
affrighted by any Mortal, how great soev
whose power can extend no further, fr
the performance of his duty. But th
for avoiding the other extreme of *petul*
cy; believe it First, that, if you could n
avoid it, yet it were much the safer ex
both for your flock, and for your sel
for your *flock*, who must needs be less pr
judiced by being charged with faults th
are not guilty of, or unseasonably, th
by being permitted in a total ignorance
such as are unquestionably dangerous,
false alarm being sometimes more secure th
none at all; and for your self, your im
prudences in this kind being alleviated b
many commendable ingredients, a zeal f
God, and a conscientious sense of yo
duty, and a good intention, and the pr
servation of a vigilant and active Spir
which is more frequently *useful* in you
profession than its *restraint*. But Second
ly, for avoiding it, if you take care th
neither your self, nor the person concer
ed, be in a passion when you advise hi
you will both find him more tractable, an
your self more rulable, and more stead
in observing the prescriptions you have r
solve

ſolved on before. And then, for furniſhing you with ſuch rules of reſtraint of anger, other ordinary books may be ſufficient; and therefore I forbear.

XX. SO alſo for your *Converſation*, that it muſt be *Sweet* and *Winning*, may appear from the ſuppoſals already premiſed. For conſidering that the perſons, you have to deal with, are not as yet ſuppoſed capable of reaſon; and your very preſcriptions themſelves bluntly propoſed, are ſufficient to make them averſe from hearkning to you, and ſo to fruſtrate your whole deſign by an unreaſonable precipitation; you muſt therefore firſt allure them, not by the reaſons of the duties themſelves, but by that great good will you are to ſhew to them, whereby they may be induced, as Children are, upon account of their Parents, or other friends they are fond of, to believe that you would never adviſe them ſuch things if you were not very confident that they would effectually conduce to their good. Now to convince them of this your good will, you muſt condeſcend to their Childiſh apprehenſions as far as is Lawful, that is, you muſt ſhew it by a ſweet and willing readineſs to promote that which themſelves conceive to be for their good where it may not prove really inconſiſtent with it, by XX.

an avoiding all needleſs occaſions of offending them, and by that means ſhewing an unwillingneſs to impoſe any thing on them to which they are averſe, without a great conviction of its being uſeful for their greater intereſts. But for this end you need not imitate them in all their actions, for that were not *to reach them out of the ditch*, but *to fall in your ſelf for Company*. But you muſt bear with their impertinencies, and ſtill (as near as you can) proportion their preſent duty to their preſent habitual abilities, not diſcouraging them in their failings, but rather thence taking occaſion to ſtir them up to a greater future diligence; and have a care of making them entertain harſh and unworthy notions of Religion: *That it is a ſtate of life, melancholy and ſad, and a perpetual valediction to all joy and comfort; that it renders a Man burdenſome to himſelf, and troubleſome to all the Society with whom he does converſe; that is ſo wholly deſigned for future hopes as that it can have no portion in preſent enjoyments.* Rather let them know by your doctrine and behaviour, *that it is not an exchange of joy for ſorrow, even in this life; but of inferior, baſer, leſs ſolid and leſs laſting joys for ſuch as are incomparably more valuable and more ſecure;*

secure; and that it is so far from disturbing or embittering Societies as that, on the contrary, it obliges both to love and to be worthy to be loved, to do all the good we can to all mankind, which must needs mutually endear them; and qualifie them for a mutual renunciation of their own wills in compliance with each other, and that indeed, not only by way of complement. By all means therefore be chearful before company, that you may not bring an ill report upon the pleasant Land of Promise, like the murmuring spies (*b*) but take a special complacency in seeing others chearful as well as your self (it was recorded as a saying of our *Saviour* in the interpolated Gospel according to the *Nazarenes: Nunquam læti sitis nisi cum fratres in charitate videritis*) and do not willingly give any offence to any, but where justice and their own greater interest require it; and even then, take care that their offence rather be, at their own *guilt*, than your *way of admonition*, at least beware that they may have no *just reason* to take offence at it. But especially take care to behave your self chearfully in your exercises of austerity, that they may understand that there are indeed other joys besides those of sense, and that they are chiefly then to be

(*b*) Num. xiii, xiv.

expected when the mind is freest from worldly solaces. But that which will be a special endearment of you to Society, will be neither to speak evil of any behind their backs your self, nor to hearken to such as would; to prevent all quarrels before your presence, which will be easier, either by preventing the occasion or increase of passion, which will be also so much easier if it be taken before it grow unrulable; or by diverting the discourse, or withdrawing one from the other; or, if they be already fallen out, by endeavouring their reconciliation, and a good understanding among them for the future; to be the common preservative of peace among your flock, and the Arbitrator of their differences. Yet you must withal take heed that this compliance be not prejudicial to that *gravity* and *seriousness* which is necessary for preserving that Sacred respect to your *Office* primarily, and to your *Person* in regard of your Office, which is necessary for deterring many, even in a mute way, from their sins, by virtue of those unobliterated impressions of Conscience and Modesty, and that slavish honour of virtue and shame of vice, which naturally seize on the most debauched persons imaginable. And seeing that the whole recommendation

on of your Doctrine is, as I said before, in accommodation to these Childish apprehensions of the vulgar, resolved into their esteem of your person; you ought above all things to be tender of those requisites that are necessary either for acquiring this esteem, or its preservation. And this seeming contradiction that seems to be betwixt this *Compliance* and *Awfulness* may thus conveniently be reconciled, if you observe, that your *Compliance* be in your *Censures*, but your *Awfulness* in your *Practise*; by being a mild Judge of other Mens Actions, but a severe censurer of your own; condemning only *evil things* in others, but the very *appearances* of *evil* in your self, as you must needs do if you would be *examplary*, and you must be exemplary if you would *awe*. For in order to your own practise, you must consider, not only the *nature* of the *thing*, but the *Decorum* of your *person* (which, because it is so necessary for capacitating you for the discharge of your Calling, you must be obliged to observe under pain of *Sin*) so that That may be lawful for a *Laick*, which cannot be so for you. For your own persons sake therefore you are to forbear, not only such things as are *unlawful in their own nature*, but such as are *inexpe-*

dient, not only ſuch as are *inxepedient*, but ſuch as are *indecent*; not only ſuch as are *indecent for others*, but ſuch as are ſo *for you*; not only ſuch as *are ſo*, but ſuch as may *appear ſo*; not only ſuch as may appear ſo on *juſt and reaſonable grounds*, but ſuch as may be *thought ſo* by others, and ſo may engage them in ſin, though *unjuſtly and unreaſonably*. Nay, even in things that were *lawful* for you, it were well that, if they be any thing *light* and *trivial*, as exerciſes and recreations, or telling of merry ſtories; that they were either not done before the vulgar Laity, or if they be, that they be managed with ſuch ſparingneſs and abſtemiouſneſs, that it may appear that they are rather uſed for their *profit*, than their *pleaſure*, and therefore that you be neither *tedious* nor *eagerly concerned* in them. But moſt of all you are to take care of jeſting with the inferior Laity themſelves, who, as they are leſs capable of reaſon, and ſo more awed by theſe ceremonial diſtances, are alſo more apt to deſpiſe you, when they ſee them tranſgreſſed by you.

XXI. XXI. BUT that which is the firſt ſecond and third requiſite for this Calling, as the *Orator* ſaid concerning *Pronunciation* in *Rhetorick*, is *a Holy and an Exemplary*

plary Life. For ſeeing that the vulgar is thus to be decoyed to embrace your Doctrine, not for its *Reaſon*, but for the *reſpect* they are firſt to entertain *for its Preacher*; as you muſt maintain your own credit among them, that they may be ready to believe what is taught them by you, ſo you muſt alſo let them underſtand that what you teach them is indeed believed by your ſelf, and they can have no reaſon to believe you do ſo unleſs they ſee you practiſe it. For do not the ſame duties oblige, and the ſame menaces belong to you, as to them? and cannot you (even by your own confeſſion) expect a more favourable hearing? (if you may not fear one more ſevere for the reaſons already mentioned) and is *Hell* and *Damnation* the acknowledged reward of thoſe actions you are guilty of your ſelf? If you were fearful that this were true, certainly you would not venture on them; if you venture on them, how is it credible that you do believe them? If you do not believe them your ſelf, how can you perſwade others to believe them for your ſake, who are (as I ſaid before) uncapable themſelves of judging of your ſolid Reaſon. How little ſolid ſoever this way of arguing be in it ſelf, yet aſſure your ſelf, it is that on

which the practises of the vulgar, to whose apprehensions you are to accommodate your self in this affair, are mainly grounded. I might have shewn you also further what influence this would have in procuring the qualifications already mentioned, that belong to Morality. For *Experience*; you must needs be better acquainted in dealing with other mens conditions, when you had first tryed their weaknesses in your self. This would inform you how tender a thing *Conscience* is, and yet how ticklish, how many misunderstandings it is obnoxious to, and how it is influenced by the difference of mens humors and constitutions. And this must, at least, make you tender and cautious in dealing with them. For *Prudence* also, that being nothing else but the *impartiality whereby right Reason is able to judge concerning circumstances*; and the *rectitude of Reason* consisting in the immunity of the understanding from all prejudices, either *intellectual* or *moral*; holiness of life contributing to this immunity, removing those moral prejudices which are of greatest concernment here, must also be considerably advantagious for enabling it to judge *prudently*. So also for *Courage* and *Confidence*, how can he fear the faces of Men who undervalues

all

all that for which they fancy themſelves ſo very terrible, even *Death* it ſelf with whatſoever aggravations; who has the encouragement of glorious future hopes, and preſent viſitations; who is fully confident of the good will of God (from whom he receives them, when incurred in his Service) that his Tribulations ſhall be proportioned to his abilities; and accordingly that, if they be great, his Conſolations ſhall be the more, which are ſo much valuable beyond them, that the *ſevereſt Tribulations* prove in the event the *greateſt Bleſſings*, as intitling him to ſuch Bleſſings? So alſo it has been already ſhewn how a *ſweet* and *ſociable*, yet *grave and ſerious*, behaviour is either the expreſs duty of *Religion* it ſelf, eſpecially that of a *Clergy-man*, or a neceſſary conſequence from that excellent temper Religious exerciſes are likely to bring its *Practitioners* to.

XXII. NOW becauſe this *Sanctity of life*, as in you, muſt alſo be *Exemplary*, it will therefore be neceſſary that it have two qualifications; that it be *Excellent*, and that it be *Conſpicuous*. For an *Example* muſt be underſtood, in regard of them to whom it is propounded, to have the notion of a *Rule*; and a *Rule* muſt be able to rectifie the Actions that are to be ruled by it; which it cannot XXII.

not do if either *there be any obliquity in it self, or if its rectitude be unknown to the party concerned in it.* Its *Excellency* must be necessary in respect of the *Vulgar*, who are concerned to imitate it; and therefore must exceed the strict duty of a *Laick*. For usually Learners do allow themselves a liberty of falling short of their Copy; and therefore if ever the Laity do reach the severity of their Pastor; either they must thence forward not make his Practise their Precedent, or be negligent of a further progress. The former I have already intimated, how unsuitable it is to their ordinary apprehensions. And how dangerous the later is, every mans experience may inform him; that whilst he grows negligent, he looses what he *has*, as well as fails of the gains he *might have* made; and besides that is never likely to reach to that perfection, at which, it is the duty of a *Laick*, as well as a *Clergy-man* to aim. And you must remember with what favour they are likely to judge their own having reached your example. Besides, you should consider that they will not measure their own perfection by the multitude of duties, but the excellent manner of performing them; and that they are all sensible (of what is truth whether they were so or not) that

you

you are obliged to ſome duties in which they are not any ways concerned; and that therefore they diſcharging their own duties as well as you do yours, though they be fewer, yet that they are equal with you. You muſt therefore ſo behave your ſelf as to neglect no part of your duty: whether as to your *general*, or your *particular calling*; as a *Chriſtian*, or as a *Clergy-man*, that may be ſubject to the obſervation of Men (for this kind of *Perfection* is acknowledged poſſible by all *Proteſtants*) and that, not only in omitting no duty, but in performing all the good that may be expected from your *Profeſſion*. Otherwiſe how can you *(i) ſilence Blaſphemers* with confuſion and ſhame whilſt they may have any juſt occaſion of carping at you? How can you *(k) adorn your Profeſſion*, and bring even Infidels to an acknowledgment of the glory of God by the excellency of your Converſation? Remember that theſe expreſſions now mentioned from the *Apoſtles*, are ſet down as the duty of *Private Chriſtians*; and what ſeverity muſt then be neceſſary for them who are to be *patterns*, not only to the *World*; but alſo to thoſe who are to be their *Precedents*? And beſides your *greater duties*, it will concern you to be punctual even

(i) S. Pet. iii. 16.

(k) Tit. ii. 10. 1. Pet. ii. 12.

even in *small things*; in fulfilling your duty, and performing your promises, how frivolous soever the matter were. For this was it that gained the Pharisees such a reputation of Sanctity; and yet not blamed by our Saviour, but their *Hypocrisie* in observing these minute things with a scrupulous severity, but neglecting the weightier matters of the Law without reluctancy. But especially it will concern you to be cautious and severe in such virtues as concern *a moral civil Conversation*, and in matters of *worldly interest*. For these are the peculiar objects of the *Love*, and consequently of the *Jealousie*, of the *Vulgar*, and therefore here you may expect to find them most *severely Critical*. And if these virtues be taken care of, you may expect to find them more favourable in censuring *vices of the Spirit*. For this is that which so ingratiates the *Quakers*, and other *Enthusiasts*, with them, whose other vices of *uncharitable censoriousness*, and *Spiritual pride*, and *Imperious dogmatizing*, are so far from being noted by them as that, when they gain *Proselytes*, it is not upon *rational accounts* (which they disclaim under the opprobrious name of *carnal reasonings*) but by a recommendation of their *Persons*, upon account of their severe observation of *secular Justice*.

XXIII.

XXIII. BUT it is also further necessary that this *Excellency be conspicuous*. And this qualification, though of Excellent use for your Flock, may prove of dangerous consequence to your self, if not discreetly managed. The use of it for the good of others appears from those passages of Scripture, wherein Christians are called (*l*) *the salt of the Earth*, (*m*) *the City that is placed on a hill, and cannot be hid*, φωστῆρες (*n*) *the Luminaries of the World*, (*o*) *not to be concealed under Bushels, but placed in Candlesticks*; and where they are commanded (*p*) *to let their light so shine before men, that they might see their good works, and glorifie their Father which is in Heaven*. Many of which are spoken indeed to private Christians as well as others; but especially concern the Clergy, who are to be luminaries to the Commonalty, as they to the Gentile World. And upon this account (the necessity of the Church requiring it) St. *Paul* himself (*q*) *becomes a fool* (it is his own expression) even in publishing the materials of his own praise: the suffering, and miracles, nay the Revelations, which were such as might not only prefer him before the false Apostles, but equal him to the true ones themselves. And most expressly he perswades them (*r*) *to provide for things honest, not only before God, but*

XXIII.

(*l*) S. Mat. v. 13. Mark. ix. 50. Luk. xiv. 34.
(*m*) Mat. v. 14.
(*n*) Phil. ii. 15.
(*o*) Mat. v. 15. Mark iv. 21. Luk. viii. 16. xi. 33.
(*p*) Mat. v. 16.
(*q*) 2 Cor. xii. 11.
(*r*) Rom. xii. 17. 2 Cor. viii. 21.

but also before men. Accordingly the *Bishops* by the *Antient Canons* were not to go any where without the attendance of some of their *Clergy* that might be able to give Testimony of their behaviour; and St. *Ambrose*, (s) that severe distributer of his time, prohibited none for coming to him at any time, tho he supposed that persons would not be so unmannerly as to disturb him unnecessarily when they saw him better employed, as St. *Augustine* witnesses; and another *Bishop*, in (t) *Sozomen* is mentioned to have kept open house, that any might at any time surprize him if engaged in any indecent Action. You must not therefore think that when our Saviour reproves the Pharisees for doing their Actions so (u) *that they might be seen of Men*, and on the contrary seems to prescribe such a secresie as that (x) *the right hand may not know what the left hand does*, that it is in all cases forbidden that our good Actions be known, or that we are always obliged to conceal them; but that it is expedient that we conceal them when their publication may not be peculiarly serviceable for the edification of others; not to publish them for any complacency we are to take in them our selves, but meerly for that Service to God for which we may be enabled by our Reputation

(s) S. *Augustin.* Lib. vi. Confess. c. 3.

(t) *Acacius Berœus. Sozom.* Eccl. Hist. Lib. vii. c. 27. *Niceph. Cal.* Lib. xii. c. 47.

(u) S. Mat. vi. 2. 5.

(x) ib. v. 3.

utation among Men. I confess the publication of virtues is very disadvantageous in several regards for the person: partly because *Experience* shews that the *heats* of *Religious Passions* themselves, as well as others, *evaporate* by being *vented*; partly because it exposes us more to the inspection and *Censures of Men*, which, whatever they be, may prove dangerous to us if they be intended by us. For it is hard to intend them without some *complacency* and *concernedness* in them, which, whether it be for *God's sake* or *our own*, is alike dangerous. For if we be *concerned*, then we must needs be *discouraged* if they fall *contrary* to our expectations; or if they prove *favourable*, it will be very hard to distinguish what is useful for the Service of God, and what only gratifies our own humors in the object of our complacencies. Which difficulty is by so much the more dangerous, inasmuch as it is more Spiritual, and less easily discernable, virtues either supposed or real being its most dangerous temptation. This is a deplorable case, to be at the expence of denying our selves, and suffering all the difficulties of materially virtuous Actions, and yet to lose the reward of them by seeking it unduely and preposterously. But on the other side, the conveniences

niences of having your Resolutions and several of your Actions known, are: that exposing your self hereby to *publick censure*, you may, *if true*, take them for warnings and admonitions; if false, for tryals and exercises of your Patience; that you may therefore terrifie and awe your self into a greater caution, when you remember so many *Critical* eyes ready to observe your lapses; that you may avoid many impertinent temptations which all will be ashamed to motion to a person unlikely to entertain them. And assure your self that it were much more beneficial for the edification of your *Flock*, that you were *Hypocrital* than *Licentious*; and that it is the safer extreme to err in professing *too much* than *too little*, as long as it does not *appear* that your Profession is not real. For the Hypocrite only perishes himself, but may notwithstanding *save others though* himself *be Reprobate*, as the *Apostle* does (*y*) imply; and he honours Religion even in counterfeiting it, which must needs alleviate his condemnation; not now to mention that Hypocrisy by *surreption* (which is the only one that a well-meaning Person is in danger of) is both less dangerous, and less imputable than Hypocrisy by *design*. But the scandalous licentious person is like the

(*y*) 1 Cor. ix. 17.

the *Dragon* in the *Revelations* (z) that involves the very *Stars* in his own ruin; or like him in the *Gospel*, who not only breaks the Evangelical prescriptions himself, but *also teaches others to do so too.* Who though he do it in the most frivolous instances, yet our Saviour himself threatens that he should be the least in the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, none at all, as it is usually understood S. *Matth.* v. 19. Though, for my part, I had rather understand by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, the *Gospel state* (for this seems to be the notion of it St. *Matth.* iii. 2. iv. 17. x. 7. xi. 11. xiii. 24, 31, 33, 41, 44, 45, 47, 52. xviii. 23. xx. 1. xxii. 2. xxv. 1. and of the Kingdom of God, S. *Matth.* xii. 28. xxi. 43. *Mark* i. 15. iv. 26, 30. *Luk.* iv. 43. vii. 28. viii. 1. x. 9, 11. xi. 20. xiii. 18, 20. and accordingly the *Gospel* itself is called *the Gospel of the Kingdom*, and they who are interessed in it, *the Sons of the Kingdom*, upon several occasions) and by *the being least therein*, the least participation of its priviledges. According to which the meaning will be: that he who teaches Men to despise the least injunctions of the Gospel (who yet may still own himself a Professor of it, which cannot justly be pretended of him that teaches to despise the greatest) shall

(z) Rev. xii. 4.

 enjoy

enjoy least of the Gospel priviledges, whether it be in a diminution of his reward, or a mitigation of punishment, or in enjoying exterior priviledges only in opposition to the interior. I have the rather mentioned these perswasions, because I verily believe the fear of being noted of *Singularity* and *Hypocrisie* and *Affectation* does deter many, not only of the *Laity*, but the *complying Clergy* themselves of our Church, from making an exterior profession of what they do most conscientiously practice in private; to whose Consideration I shall only at present recommend that severe threatning of our Lord, that *Whosoever, who are ashamed of him before Men, he will also be ashamed before his Father and his Holy Angels.* Now that you may accommodate these difficulties together, and so let your other Vertues appear, as that their *appearance* may not prove prejudicial to your Modesty; you must take heed that that publick applause do not provoke you to think better of your self than you really deserve; which you may have reason to avoid, if you remember: That whatever Men think of you, yet *you are really no greater than God knows you to be*, and that by this measure you must expect your reward; That Men are fallible

Mar. vii. 38. Luk. ix. 26.

fallible in their *Judgments* (judging according to *Fondness*, or *Affection*, or *Charity*, which will not only *provoke*, but *oblige*, them to judge well when they find no reason to the contrary, though indeed there be; by which means good Men themselves may be mistaken in judging *too favourably* of you, and that *Commendably*, in reference to themselves) and in their *Informations*, knowing nothing but the bare *action*, but not the *intention*, from whence all its morality is most properly, and most securely, estimable. Be sure therefore that this shewing your Works to others be like the (a) *Cloud in the Wilderness*, which on the one side enlightned the *Israelites*, but on the other darkened the *Ægyptians*. So let their excellencies appear outwardly, that they may stir up your Spectators to the praise of God, and the emulation of your Example; as that, at the same time, only their Imperfections may appear inwardly to your self, which may prostrate you to as low a Humiliation. Besides, it were well that besides what they knew, you would reserve some greater Excellency unknown, for which yon might only have regard to God, who sees in secret what he will openly reward. For if you can do

Exod. xiv. 14.

any Excellent action for which you can have no motive or design in *this World*; then it will be clear that, even in those whereby you may gain secular applause, yet that is not your either only, or ultimate, motive. And in general, where you find their *commendations* exceed your *merits*, let it stir you up to a *virtuous shame* of *being* less worthy than you *seem*.

XXIV. XXIV. BUT that without which all these qualifications will not suffice, if separated from it, and without which you cannot prudently venture on such a dangerous Calling, is a *Resolution* of persisting in them all firmly and unmoveably for the future. For this is the *prudent Consideration* of the builder so much commended by our Saviour (and you must remember that the Analogy holds very well in the *Clerical Calling*, for as himself is called an *Architect*, 1 *Cor.* iii. 10. so his employment is called *Edification*, not only there, but also *Rom.* xv. 20. *Gal.* ii. 18. 2 *Cor.* x. 8. xii. 19. xiii. 10. *Eph.* ii. 20, 21. iv. 11, 12.) that built his House upon a Rock, against which neither the rainy Torrent, nor the violent Rivers, nor the Tempestuous Winds, were able to prevail. S. *Matth.* vii. 24, 25. For you must remember that

not

not to maintain your building is as great folly and Imprudence as *not to finish it*; though indeed, *final Perseverance* being the only accomplishment of this building, it cannot be *finished* if it be not *maintained*. You must therefore besides the former qualifications, which are requisite to this purpose, remember that the Calling, you are undertaking, will oblige you for your *life*, and therefore your choice, if imprudently made, will *therefore* be of worse consequence, because it is irrevocable; so that your chief care must be to foresee whether you be able to persevere afterwards in maintaining what you have begun, and that for your whole life. And for this end you must consider your qualifications themselves: whether they have appeared only in *single Acts* or in *Habits*; or if in Habits, whether they be *newly acquired* or *strongly confirmed* and *rooted* by *custom*; for you cannot trust any other Habits for their duration for so long a time. Besides you must consider whether your Temper be *fickle*, or *stable*: if it be fickle, you can trust no Habits themselves longer than you persevere in the same humour, or till they may decay gradually according to the method of their acquisition. Then also you must consi-

der the *difficulties* you may have occasion to conflict with, which if they be less than those you have already dealt with, or *equal*, you may hope to persevere; but if *greater*, you cannot conclude that, because your Habits have been so confirmed as not to yield to smaller Difficulties, therefore they would be able to hold out in greater Tryals. And for those you must not only foresee such as you are likely to encounter at your first entrance upon this holy Calling, but such as you may probably meet with in the course of your whole life, but still with regard to the proficiency you may make in confirming those Habits you have against the time you may have occasion to meet them in, if you be not deficient to your self. Nor would I have you think that I herein make your *future hopes* of the Grace of God a *Cypher*, in requiring you to foresee all future difficulties, and to measure them by proportion to your *presents strengths*. For you see I do not deny the necessity of the Grace of God for bringing you to this excellent frame of Spirit I have been hitherto describing. Nor do I deny all such hopes of Grace for the *future* as may be grounded on Covenant-conditions, your co operation and improvement of what you have at present.

present. So that the only Grace whose hopes I have seemed to exclude, is that which is extraordinary and uncovenanted, such as is all that which is necessary for overcoming those difficulties, which you have voluntarily incurred your self, and which were not likely to befal you in an *ordinary course of Providence*, nor are brought upon you by an *extraordinary*. But as for other difficulties, which *cannot be foreseen*, but are meerly *casual* in respect of *second Causes*; you need not be so *anxious*, but leave them confidently to that Providence which has prohibited your carefulness for them; and do not fear your being disappointed in such dependences as are not *rash* and *imprudent*, as long as you are otherwise careful of performing those *Duties* on which your Title to these *Promises* do depend.

XXV. IF you be already engaged in Orders, as this discourse supposes you not to be, you may be tempted to think all that has hitherto been said digressive and unseasonable. But you will find no reason to do so after a little recollection. For as, if you be not, there will be no occasion for such a surmise; so if you be, yet it will be useful to you, if not as a warning to shew you what you are to do, yet XXV.

at least as an information, both what you ought to have done before, and what you ought therefore to be penitent for, if you hitherto have neglected it, and upon what you are to lay out your whole endeavours for the future. But, to proceed, supposing now that you are the Person I have been hitherto describing, you cannot stand in need of any *particular Rules*; for if you be thus called by God you shall be *taught by him* in the performance of the duty to which he has called you (I mean this *Teaching* as well as the *Call* in an *ordinary providential sense*, which is that wherein the Prophesies concerning it are verified under the Gospel) for both this *Prudence* and *other Abilities* will be able to guide, and this *Piety* to suggest, what is fit to be done upon all particular exigencies; and as those themselves are gifts of the Spirit, so their improvement will entitle you to greater, so that their direction and influence is rather to be imputed to God than Man, though it be true, that now by virtue of the Evangelical Covenant they are usually conferred in the use of ordinary means, and this, reaching particular circumstances, must needs make all rules unnecessary. If you do not understand this coherence, you may more clearly by this chain

chain of principles: First, the Providential teaching and direction of God is that of Right Reason, so that they that are led by it are led by God; Secondly, that we may be led by right Reason two things are *necessary*, and these two are *perfectly sufficient*: First, that the rational faculties be rectified; and Secondly, that the lower appetite and other executive faculties be in a ready disposition of being obedient to reason. And both these must needs have been supposed in the qualifications now mentioned. For the rectifying of the rational faculty *does* require only: that nothing be taken for granted precariously, and that the understanding be not diverted from its ordinary natural course of examining things to the full. For it is from the first principles of reason *impossible* that the understanding taking no principles for granted but such as deserve to be so, and proceeding orderly in deducing consequences from them, should be mistaken. I do not mean that the understanding proceeding thus is always infallible as to the *nature of the thing*, because it may mistake some principles for self-evident that are not so, merely upon an account of that natural dulness it contracts from the body; but it is always infallible *as a rule of Morality*,

rality, that is, *the lower faculties conforming to it can never be guilty of any Immorality*, becauſe the error, if any be, muſt needs be *invincible*, and ſo *inculpable*. And upon this account God, who does not undertake, nor is concerned, to direct the underſtanding any further than it is neceſſary for the ſaving of the perſon, cannot be reaſonably conceived to have any other Infallibility in his deſign than this moral one, at leaſt, is not obliged to have it. Now for the rectifying of the rational faculties you are *Firſt*, ſuppoſed to have uſed means for informing it by your skill in thoſe ſeveral Studies which have been hitherto adviſed; you are *Secondly*, diſſwaded and prevented from imbibing any prejudices, or any corrupt affections for one party by your immediate recourſe to the Originals themſelves; you are *Thirdly*, adviſed for the moſt accurate improvement of your judgment in a clear and advantageous method of reaſoning; and *Fourthly*, in the uſe of all theſe means you have been ſhewn how you may in an ordinary way be confident of the aſſiſtance of Divine Providence in ſuch caſes as you cannot ſecure your ſelf in by your moral diligence: whether for removing ſuch prejudices as you could otherwiſe hardly

diſcover

discover to be so; or by Providential placing you in such circumstances wherein those Reasons may offer themselves to your cognizance which you could otherwise never have discovered; or by capacitating your judgment for a more equal censure concerning them; whether by improving your natural capacity to a more than ordinary perspicuity; or by rendring intellectual objects more intelligible by your greater experience and familiarity, and fixation of your mind upon them; or by fitting them to such times when your judgment may be less distracted, and consequently more quick and apprehensive, and by giving his holy Spirit by virtue of which they are to be discerned. Now when all these things are thus secured, certainly there cannot be more probable human means thought on for finding even the truth it self, and therefore the rational faculties must have the greatest security they are capable of, and to greater they cannot be obliged. And then, considering that natural Reason thus purified is (*b*) *the Candle of the Lord*, and that the Spirit which may thus be expected is the (*c*) *Spirit that leadeth into all Truth*, and the (*d*) *Divine Unction that teaches all things*; I do not see why it may not be

(*b*) Prov. xx. 27.
(*c*) Joh. xvi. 13.
(*d*) Joh. ii. 20, 27.

be ſaid as truly here as it was falſely ſaid of (e) *Herod*, that the judgment of Reaſon thus rectified is *not the voice of Man, but of God*. And then for the ſecond thing required to this rectitude of Reaſon, the ſubjection of the lower Appetite to the ſuperior part of the Soul thus rectified, that is the whole deſign of a *good life*, a qualification already ſufficiently recommended, which therefore needs not to be further ſpoken of at preſent.

(e) Act. xii. 22.

XXVI. XXVI. SO that, if you be already Ordained, you ſee, that according to theſe principles, your main duty will be, either ſeriouſly to ſet your ſelf to the acquiring theſe qualifications, if you have hitherto neglected them; or, if you have not, *to take a care of keeping your Garment that none may ſee your ſhame, and retaining your firſt love* (the very warnings of our Saviour himſelf to thoſe of your profeſſion, *Rev.* iii. 18. ii. 4.) to perſevere in thoſe excellent diſpoſitions that you have ſo happily begun, and from thence to deduce Rules for your following Practices. For rendring theſe requiſites a little more uſeful, I ſhall only add two things more, and ſo put an end to your preſent diſturbance. The firſt ſhall be concerning the manner either of acquiring, or exerciſing

these gifts, especially relating to practice, that may be most beneficial both to your self, and the publick; the second concerning the manner of dealing with your Parishioners that may make them capable of your Instructions. Concerning the former, it has been already intimated before, that the most proper way of perswading mankind is first to allure them to the performance of actions *materially virtuous*, and by a frequent repetition of them to beget an *easiness* and *delight*, and a *rooted habit*, which, when acquired, and that *averseness* and *sensuality*, which before had rendred Men uncapable of good Councils, being removed, you may then propound your Reasons with success, and rectifie their Intentions, and render them *formally virtuous*. That therefore which will most concern you, for the *Publick* as well as your *own Soul*, is, the rectifying your intention. Seeing therefore right intention is to be measured from the due end, you must take care that all your Religious actions in general be designed with an intention so habitual and deeply rooted, as that all particular ones may, according to the degree of deliberation they proceed from, partake of the same either *virtually* and *interpretatively*, or *explicitely* and *particularly*.

ticularly. Now the proper end of Religious actions being the service and pleasing of God, you must take care that they be performed with that design which you know to be most pleasing to him: and that is the doing them purposely for his sake; and that they are so done you may best satisfie your self by examining whether they proceed from a principle of Divine Love. Exercise your self therefore daily to bring your self to this habitual sense of the Divine Love, which will even in this life abundantly recompence the pains you may be at in acquiring it. For both in respect of *your self* and of *your Flock* you shall find it advantageous. To your self the advantages will be: that by this means you shall best secure the reward of your virtuous actions, when you do not only perform them, but perform them upon a virtuous motive; that by this means your duty shall become, not a *task*, but, a *real pleasure*, proceeding from such a pleasing and endearing principle; and having the omnipotence and good will of God to *secure you* from the fears of disappointment when your desires are *reasonable*; and as a sure *Refuge* and *Sanctuary* to have recourse to, when they *are not*; and that you will not be subject to the slavery

ſlavery of ſuch deſires themſelves, which are the Originals of all Miſery even in this Life; and your performance of your duty will be more univerſal; not only in things *agreeing* with your humour, but even in thoſe which are moſt *contradictory* to it, which will be ſo much the *more acceptable* to God by how much it is *leſs ſo* to our ſelves. Beſides, it were well that you would endeavour to render your love as *rational* as you can, and as little dependent on the paſſions of the lower appetites; for by this means your tranquility will be continual, and not depend on the viciſſitudes of humours; ſeeing, if you be led only by reaſon, that being always *true*, muſt conſequently be always *ſeaſonable*; and that the reaſon whereby you judge concerning your own condition were rather grounded on your *Actions* than your *Affections*, ſo as never to think better of your ſelf when you find your affections *warm*, if your actions are not correſpondent; nor the worſe, when your affections *Flagg*, your actions ſtill continuing conformable. This rational rectifying of your intention would ſtill oblige you to keep an habitual attention and watchfulneſs over your actions, and yet would make attention it ſelf leſs neceſſary by being

being habitual, and make it leſs affected. It would make it *leſs neceſſary*, becauſe *virtuous habits*, as well as *vitious*, would breed a *facility* and *inclination* to *virtuous actions* even antecedently to *deliberation*. It would make it *leſs affected*, becauſe Piety would appear in ſuch actions where affectation could not take place, as well as where it might (for indeliberate actions are not capable of affectation) and becauſe it would make an uniformity in all actions of your life, which were remarkable. Which muſt needs make your life exemplary with more advantage to your ſelf, as well as to the vulgar: *to your ſelf*, becauſe obſerving of Rules could not be practiſed but in actions deliberate, which are but few, and muſt be handled more tediouſly; whereas this way of ſecuring acts by habits and habitually right intentions, would at once provide for all, by diminiſhing their number, and by directing ſuch as would remain: *to the multitude*; who by this means muſt better be convinced of the truth and ſincerity of their Paſtor, when their moſt accurate inſpection could diſcern no affectation, and that by all appearances it ſeemed *real*, not *hypocritical*.

XXVII.

XXVII. FOR *managing your Cure* it were well that you would constantly allot some time daily from your Studies for *visiting them*, when you shall think them best at leisure. And because the particular persons may be more than you may be able to deal with in an *ordinary way*, therefore for their ordinary Cure you should first win *Parents* and *Masters* of Families to a sense of Piety, which being once performed, you may then easily induce them to a care of the Souls of their (*f*) *Children* and *Sevants*, by shewing them how their Religion would conduce to their very *secular interest* (that hereby their *Servants* would prove *more faith-*

(*f*) This was required from all Ecclesiastical persons: Item, That every Holy-day throughout the year, when they have no Sermon, they shall immediately after the Gospel, openly and plainly recite to their Parishioners in the Pulpit, the Pater Noster, the Credo, and the Ten Commandments in English, to the intent that the People may learn the same by heart, Exhorting all Parents and Householders to teach their Children and Servants the same as they are bound by the Law of God, and in conscience to do. Injunct. by K. Edward vi. in the Collect. aforesaid p. 22. Injunct. by Q. Elizabeth A. 1559. p. 69 ib. Item, whether they have charged Fathers and Mothers, Masters and Governours of Youth, to bring them up in some virtuous Study or Occupation. Articl. of Visitation by Arch-B. Cranm. under Edw. vi. p. 26.

ful, and their *Children more obedient* and comfortable to them) that therefore they should keep up their *Family Duties* constantly; their *Morning* and *Evening Prayers*; that occasionally they would instil an instruction in their Duties, by having some good Book read to them all, especially the *Whole Duty of Man*, according to the Method of the Partitions therein prescribed, every *Sunday* one; that they would, by your advice prescribe some select (g) passages of Scripture fitted for their practical use, *to be gotten by heart to them*; to instruct them, as they find them capable, in the Art of *Holy Meditation* and *mental Prayer*; to stir them up to a *frequent Communion*, and to desire your *Advice* upon occasion of any important scruple, whether in order to the Sacrament, or upon any other occasion; and to influence them all by their *word*, and *example*, and *exhortation*, and *peculiar encouragement*. Then endeavour what you can, to abolish the *Nurseries of Vice and publick Debauchery*, not by imploring the Magistrates assistance (that becomes secular persons rather than your self, and would be apt to harden the hearts of the persons

(g) This was enjoyned on all Teachers of Children: 41. Item. That they shall accustom their Scholars reverently to learn such sentences of Scripture as shall be most expedient to induce them to all godliness. Injunct. by Q. Elizabeth 1559. p. 78.

persons concerned against you; when they should find your exhortations backed with no better arguments) but by perswasions; partly by dissuading the multitude of such Callings as are interessed in Mens Vices (such are *Taverns* and *Ale-houses*, especially the most debauched of them) to give over that kind of Calling, and betake themselves to something more *profitable* for the *Commonwealth*, and more *secure* for their *own Souls*; or (which is much easier) to prevent the multitude of youth to be engaged in those Callings, either by principling the youth themselves, or by possessing Parents with a sense of the great Spiritual inconveniences which are almost inseparable from them, especially where numerous. Concerning this you may make use of the advise and assistance of your more able Parishioners, who may be best experienced in the Commodities of the Country, and may be able to employ them even in raising new advantageous Arts of Trading, if it be necessary. But for those Trades that are directly unlawful, if they be not able to undertake any other, it were better that they were maintained on the publick Charity than that they should be suffered to return to their former employments. You may see

for this St. *Cyprians* Epistle *ad Eucratium* L. 1. Ep. 10. So also it were well that those Taverns and Ale-houses, which might be permitted after the detraction of their superfluous number, were confined to Inns who by their paucity might gain *sufficiently* and *virtuously* a convenient maintenance. And to this purpose you might persuade them to keep *small drink*, that none may be necessitated to use their *strong*; and to take care of either *tempting* or *permitting* any to drink beyond their measure, as they would tender the security of their own Souls, which will be indangered by a participation of their Sins. Then it were well, in the next place, that you frequented the Schools, if there be any, and according to the Authority the Law allows the Clergy in such cases, examined the *care* and *method* of their *Masters*, and especially to take care of a method of instilling (*h*) Piety into their Children, which their Masters may practise them in;

(h) 41. Item. That all Teachers of Children shall stir and move them to a love and due reverence of Gods true Religion, now truly set forth by publick Authority. Injunct. by Queen Elizabeth 1559. p. 78.

Et quoties habebitur sacra Concio, eos vel emittent, vel deducent ad templum, ut statim a teneris incipiant eruditi ad pietatem, &c. Lib. Quorund. Canon. An. 1571. p. 240. & Can. An. 1603.

or,

or, if their Masters be negligent, you should allure and encourage them your self. Do not despise this mean employment; for both you will find them more capable of Vertue than such as are confirmed in *vitious Habits*, by a more inflexible age, and longer custom; and by this means you may more easily secure the hopes of the *next Generation*, which you may live your self to see grown up according to your own desire. Then for giving them more particular prescriptions you should stir them up to a *particular Confession* of their Sins and Temptations, according as our Mother *the* (*i*) *Church of England* and (*k*) *Ireland* approves it, but to give them no *formal Absolution* till a long experience has let you understand their *stability* in keeping their *Resolutions*, which will both keep them *careful* in their daily practises, when as yet they are uncertain of their condition; and will come with *more comfort*, either in a time of *Spiritual dejection*, or the hour of *Death*, when they shall find that you are neither *precipitant* nor *favourable* in judging concerning them; besides that their pardon before God in order to the Sacrament will be nevertheless valid because you do not

(*i*) Church of *England* visit. of the sick *Can.* cxiii. An. 1603.
(*k*) Ibid. & Can. xix. lxiv.

assure them of it. And, in doing this: it were well that, with advice of your *Ordinary*, you would retrive the Canon of this *Church of* (l) *Ireland* for tolling your *Parish Bell the Evening before the Eucharist, and waiting for such in the Church as are desirous to Confess themselves, or ask your Ghostly Council*, withal warning them of these Crimes which you are not obliged to conceal, that they may not think themselves betrayed under pretence of Religion. Besides, you should be ready to take all occasions of Peoples *seriousness* and *melancholy*, whether for *Temporal discontents*, or for *fear of Death*, and upon such occasions to warn the *Spectators* to beware of deferring the care of their Souls to such exigencies, who will then most probably be affected; and so to behave your self to the person principally concerned as that the standers by may understand the ground of his comfort to be rather his *past life* than any *indications* he can give of his *present penitence*. And upon occasion of your visitation of sick Persons, you should remember what the Rubrick of the Office requires you *to put*

(l) Can. xix.

So also the Injunct. of K. Edward VI. p. 9. the Article of visit, by *Arch. B. Cranmer* p. 20. Injunct by Q. Eliz. An. 1559. n. 2. p. 74. Articl. of *visitat.* An 1559. p. 178.

them

them that are rich in mind of laying up a good foundation for the time to come, 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19. of ſhewing their gratitude to God who has bleſſed them by paying him an acknowledgement out of their gains; and ſhewing themſelves not to be *Proprietors* but *faithful Stewards*, eſpecially if the Riches be juſtly gotten; otherwiſe you muſt refuſe their very *Oblations*, till they have firſt made ſatisfaction to the perſons injured by them. But what is juſtly gotten, and may be lawfully accepted, it were better beſtowed in a conſiderable ſum (*for Houſes of Correction for maintaining idle Vagabonds, and raiſing them to do ſomething profitable for a livelyhood; for educating and raiſing neceſſitous Perſons to an honeſt Calling; for helping thoſe who are reclaimed from a ſcandalous courſe*; for all thoſe good uſes, which in the Primitive Church were ſupplied out of the common Treaſures of the Church) than in tranſient Alms. Many other things might have been added, but that, you may Remember, I did not promiſe you an enumuration of all particulars of this kind. Only theſe ſeem more neceſſary for reducing your People to a *ruleable Temper*, without which your other care will not be ſo ſignificant. I hope you will excuſe the free-

dom I have taken; for my own part I thought I could not have discharged the duty of a faithful Friend, if I had not done so. Otherwise I have been so far from imposing on you, that I have not advised any thing, which either is not evident, or has not its reason insinuated with it in the body of my discourse; and so may freely be judged of either by your self, or any other whom you shall make use of either for its Correction or Improvement. Whatever the event may prove, assure your self, it was undertaken with a good intention, by

Your assured well-wisher, especially in such Christian Services,

H. D.

Ad Num.

Ad Num. XII. XIII.

B*Ecauſe I have there ſhewn* the neceſſity of ſtudying the Fathers of the firſt and pureſt Centuries, as a qualification for the ſuſcepti-on of Orders; *it has been by ſome friends, that peruſed it, conceived convenient for the Inſtruction of* Novices, *for whoſe uſe this Advice was principally calculated and deſigned, that I ſhould adjoyn a* Catalogue *of the Chriſtian Authors and Writings, ſuch as are genuine, during that* Period, *till the Converſion of* Conſtantine *to Chriſtianity, together with good Editions where they might find and furniſh themſelves with them. I was ſoon ſatisfied of the reaſonableneſs of this requeſt, and have accordingly endeavoured its performance, wherein if I may ſeem decretory in reſolving poſitively ſome things controverted among Learned Men, without producing my Reaſons; I deſire that it may be remembred that my deſign was not*

to

to prejudicate against skilful Dissenters, but to advise such as were unskilful; and that even in regard of them, the reason why I do not produce my reasons is not that, by concealment of my evidence, I might oblige them to depend on my Authority, but partly to avoid prolixity, and partly because I do not conceive such unskilful Readers competent Judges of them, and partly because such as are, may consult many others who have undertaken it professedly; and that though the reasons be not produced, yet the degree of assent, whether certain, *or* doubtful, *or* probable, *is warned, which was the most cautious way I could imagine of dealing with such persons, especially these things themselves not being delivered from my own private sense, but of such as have most learnedly and impartially managed this subject. I do not intend so much as to mention such Authors or Writings which I conceive undeservedly to pretend to my prescribed Period (what my thoughts are concerning such may be sufficiently concluded from my not mentioning them) nor to explode such works as are falsly inscribed to the particular persons whose names they bear, if upon other regards they may seem genuine in respect of the time intended, that is, if it be probable that their Authors*

thors who ever they were, flourished within the Period intended, about the time wherein they are ranked, that so they may be presumed competent Testimonials of the state of the Church in those Ages, *which is the end for which I produce and recommend them. Nor shall I trouble my self to recount such genuine truly inscribed works themselves, as either are not at all extant at present, or extant only in Fragments quoted at the second hand from other antient Authors; for these will be in order met with in the places from whence they are respectively produced, and references to those places will generally be found in their good and accurate Editions. Nor lastly do I pretend to give an account of such Historians as have described the Acts of the Martyrs, and are conceived antient; for both many of them are* Anonymus, *concerning whom it would be very hard to resolve on their particular Age; and it is a work particularly undertaken by it self by* Surius, Lippomannus, *&c. In those Authors therefore which shall, after these deductions, remain proper for my purpose, I shall signifie the time they flourished in (which is most necessary for my present design of discovering*

vering their Teſtimonial Authority) *not by years, which would be obnoxious to many further diſputes, but by the* beginning, middle, *or* end, of their reſpective Centuries *ſince the Incarnation.*

A

A Catalogue of the Writings of ſuch Chriſtian Authors as flouriſhed before the Converſion of the *Roman Empire* to *Chriſtanity*.

I. CLemens *Romanus*. His I. Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, undoubted. About the Year LXIV. or LXV. See what I have ſaid againſt *Grotius* cap. 3. n. 22. And upon my Lord *Cheſter* Add.ad Diſs. 11 cap.vi.n.24. Cent. 1. *mid.* and *end.*

His 2. *Ep. to the ſame*, though queſtion'd whether his, yet certainly is of an Author very ancient; flouriſhing within the Period intended. I take it for part of the antient Διδαχὴ, under the name of S. *Clement*, vid. *Diſs.* ad. *Iren.* 1. 29.

Edit. Of a Fragment of the later, and the former almoſt entire, by *Patricius Junius* at *Oxford*, Anno.Dom. MDCXXXVIII. or by *Cotelerius*, if you can get it. If not, the 2d Edition of *Oxford*, divided according to *Cotelerius's* Paragraphs is the beſt of thoſe which are eaſily to be had and cheap. This is in the Year MDCLXXVII.

II. *Hermas*. His *Paſtor* in III. Books, undoubtedly antient, and about this time, as appears by his mention of *Clemens Romanus* as a contemporary. I think, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* vid. Diſs. Sing. ad *Ceſtrienſ.* cap. 11. n. 5, 6. Cent. 2 *end.*

That he has been brought lower by being pretended to be the *Brother* to Pope *Pius*, has no antienter Teſtimony that I know of, than the *Verſes* againſt *Marcion*, under the name of *Tertullian*, the pretended *Ep.* of *Pius* to *Juſtus Viennenſ.* and the *Pontifical* aſcribed

bed to *Damasus*, all of them justly Questionable; and if they were not, yet not comparable to this express mention of St. *Clement*, in the work it self, thence produced by *Origen*. περὶ Ἀρχ. that we may not suspect it to be a modern *Interpolation*.

Edit. in *Biblioth. Patr Colon. Agrip.* MDCXVIII. *Tom.* 1. p. 27. or by *Cotelerius*. And with *Barnabas* in the *Oxford* Edition. MDCLXXXV.

Cent. 1. *mid.* and *end.* Cent. 2. *beg.* III. *Ignatius*. His vi. Ep. of Primate *Usher*'s *Latin*, and *Isacc Vossius*'s *Florentine Greek* Editions, viz.

1. *Ad Ephesios.* 6. *Ad Smyrnæos.*
2. *Ad Magnesianos.* 4. *Ad Romanos.*
3. *Ad. Trallianos.* 5. *Ad Philadelphienses.*

Questioned only, I think, out of Interest by the *Presbyterians*, because he is decretory against them.

His Epistle *ad Polycarpum* is thought by *Isaac Vossius*, and *Cotelerius*, and the Bishop of *Chester*, undeservedly questioned by our *Primate*.

Edit. by Primate *Usher* at *Oxford*, partly An. Dom. MDCXLIV. partly MDCXLVI. His is the best for the various Readings, which are wanting in *Cotelerius*.

Cent. 2. *beg.* IV. *Acta Ignatii*. Bishop *Usher* used three Copies. But that is most uncorrupt which has the figures in it referring to his Notes.

Edit. by Primate *Usher* as aforesaid.

Cent. 3. *beg.* V. *Barnabas*. His Epistle, most certainly none of the *Apostles*, who was a *Levite*, Act. iv. 36. whereas the *Author* was before his Conversion a *Gentile* and an *Idolater*. See §. 14. 16. of *Cotelerius*'s Division. Yet in all likelihood written about this time. *After* the destruction of the *Temple*, and yet *Before* the Code of the 4 Gospels were agreed on in the Church. It is near the Style of the new Testament, and so antient as to be taken for *Barnabas*'s, by *Clemens Alexandrinus* *Strom.*

Strom. ii. p. 273, 274. 285. 290. 300. v. 417. 421. and *Origen.* L. 1. cont. *Cels.* L. iii. περὶ Ἀρχ. and others. The later part is perhaps his Διδαχή. See Diss. 1. ad *Iren.* n. 31.

Edit. together with *Ignatius*'s Epistles by *Isaac Vossius* Anno. Dom. MDCXLVI. or alone by *Hugo Menardus. Paris.* MDCXLV. and *Cotelerius.* And in the *Oxford* Edition, with *Hermas*, MDCLXXXV.

VI. *Esdras.* His iv. Book *Apocryphal* counterfeited by some *Judaizing Christian* about these times. The succession of the *Roman Emperors* in him is brought down to the time of *Macrinus*, as has been observed by the most Excellent Bishop of St. *Asaph.* Cent. 2. *beg.*

VII. *Hermes Trismegistus.* His *Pœmander* thought to be a Christian counterfeit, by *Casaubon*, Exercit. i. in *Baron.* num. x. Cent. 2. *beg.*

Edit. the best by *Hannibal Rosellis* Colon. Agrip. MDCXXX. fol.

VIII. *Celsus.* His *Altercatio Jasonis & Papisci.* a *Preface* to it is extant under the name of St. *Cyprian ad Vigilium de Judaica incredulitate.* Inter opera Cypriano inscriptis, &c. Cent. 2. near the *end.*

Edit. Tom. iii. of St. *Cyprian*'s works according to *Pamelius*'s distinction. But the work is ancienter than *Origen*, by whom it is quoted. l. iv. *advers. Celsum Epicuræum.* Nay ancienter than *Celsus* himself. But *Celsus*'s time I have proved later than is commonly conceived. Diss. ad *Iren.* p. 18. and *App.* Cypriani Opera.

IX. *Polycarpus.* His Epistle to the *Philippians*, never Questioned by any that I know of, but *Daillee*, but to full satisfaction, I think, of all unprejudiced Readers, defended against him by the most Learned Bishop of *Chester*, Vind. *Ignat.* Cent. 1. *end.* 2. *beg. mid.*

Edit. with *Ignatius* by Primate *Usher* as aforesaid, and *Cotelerius.*

X. *Epistola*

Cent. 2. mid. X. *Epistola S. Petri ad Jacobum.* Prefixed before the *Clementines* newly set forth by *Cotelerius*, as also in that old Copy mentioned by *Photius*. But neither of them understood why. The true reason seems to be that this was the real *Preface* of the *Prædicatio Petri*, quoted by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, whose Author was an *Ebionite*, as appears not only from *Epiphanius*, but from this *Preface* it self. And whoever he was that patched these together, seems to have design'd the Collection of all the Ancient Apocryphals, that bore the name of *Clemens*, and accordingly to have prefixed the several *Prefaces* first together, and this among them as belonging to that Predication. *Ed.* in *Cotelerius* as aforesaid. vid. Diss. ad *Iren.* VI. 10.

Cent. 2. aft. mid. XI. *Ecclesiæ Smyrnensis Epistola*, concerning the Martyrdom of St. *Polycarp*, &c. larger than in *Eusebius*. *Edit.* the same. Or in *Valesius*'s Ed. of *Euseb. Hist.* partly in the Text, partly in his Notes.

Cent. 2. mid. XII. *Justine Martyr.* His undoubted works.

Paræneticus.

Oratio adversus Græcos.

Apologia I. ad Antoninum Pi um. &c.

Apologia II. ad Marcum Antoninum, &c.

Dialogus cum Tryphone.

Epistol. ad Zenam & Serenum.

His works, though doubted, yet most probably genuine.

De Monarchiâ, not much questioned.

Epistol. ad Diognetum, questioned, I think, only by *Sylburgius*.

Edit. Paris. MDCXV. Græco Latin.

Cent. 2. mid. XIII. *Pius* the I. His iii. and iv. *Epistles* in the order of *Blondells* Edition. I my self believe them counterfeit. I only mention them because *Blondell* has a better opinion of them for some expressions in them which

which he conceives favourable to Presbytery, and I would not prejudge the disinteressed Reader concerning them.

Edit. David Blondell. Epist. Pontif. *Geneva.* MDCXXVIII.

XIV. *Athenagoras.* His works though mentioned by none of the Ancients yet never questioned that I know of. Cent. 2. aft. *mid.*

Legatio pro Christianis.

De Resurrectione Mortuorum.

Edit. with St. *Justine Martyr*, as aforesaid. Or at *Oxford.* MDCLXXXII.

XV. *Tatianus.* undoubted. Cent. 2. aft. *mid.*

Oratio ad Græcos.

Edit. with S. *Justine Martyr*, as aforesaid.

Diatessaron, thought to be the same with *Harmonia Evangelica* extant under the name of *Ammonius Alexandrinus.*

Edit. Biblioth. Patr. *Edit. Colon. Agrip.* Tom. III. p. 22.

XVI. *Theophilus Antiochenus.* undoubted. But a little later than the Bishop of *Antioch.* Add. ad *Cestrions.* Diss. 1. cap. 2. ad *Iren.* Diss. 11. n. 44. 50. Cent. 1. aft. *mid.*

Lib. III. ad Autolycum.

Edit. with St. *Justine Martyr* as aforesaid. Or at *Oxford.* MDCLXXXIV.

Commentaria or *Allegoriæ in Evangelia*, somewhat doubted of by St. *Hierome* in Cant. who quotes them.

Edit. Biblioth. Patr. *Colon. Agrip.* Tom. II.

XVII. *Irenæus*, undoubted, *Adversus Hæreses.* L. V. Cent. 2. near the *end.*

Edit. the most compleat that I have seen is that of *Feuardentius*, having (besides as much of the Original Text in *Greek* as could be had from the quotations of ancient Authors) V. whole chapters restored

at the end not extant in any former. His notes tend rather generally to abuse the *Protestants* than to explain the sense of his *Author*. It is in fol. *Colon. Ag.* MDXCVI.

Cent. 2. near the *end.* X XVIII. *Oracul. Sibyllin. L. VIII.* A counterfeit *Christian* Author, quoted by St. *Justine Martyr* and *Theoph. Antiochenus*, but not reduced into the form wherein we have it now, till about the time of the Emperor *Commodus* at least.

Edit. Opsopœi Parisijs, MDCVII.

Cent. 2. X XIX. *Testamenta Patriarcharum* counterfeited by some antient *Judaizing Christian*, about this time at the uttermost; if it be that which is quoted by *Origen*, in *Genes.* It is doubted of by *Selden*. Since I have seen the *Greek* in M. S. I take it to have been written in the *Apostolical* Age. For the *Stile* is *Hellenistical*, and it speaks of the *Apostolical* Age as the *last* Age. Which as it was an Error of the *Apostolical* Age; so it could not have been the Error of a much *later* Author.

Edit. Biblioth. Patr. *Colon. Agrip.* Tom. I. p. 173.

Cent. 2. near the *end.* X XX. *Clemens Alexandrinus.* undoubted.

Protreptic.

Pædageg. L. III.

Stromat. L. VII.

The VIII. Book as also the *Greek Ecclogæ* annexed at the end of it, thought to belong to his *Hypotyposes*, the main body whereof is long since lost.

Edit. Parisijs MDCXL.

His τίς ὁ πλούσιος σωζόμενος, published under the name of *Origen's* XX. *Homily* on *Jerem.* is accordingly extant in *Mich. Ghislerius* on *Jerem.* Tom. III. p. 262.

Comment.

Comment. in I. Ep. S. Petr. *in Epist. S.* Judæ. *in Ep. Canonicas S.* Johannis.

Are probably the same accounted his by *Cassiodore*, Div. L. by whom they are all recounted excepting that of St. *Jude*. They seem rather to have been collected out of his works, especially his *Hypotyposes* now lost, than drawn up in this form by St. *Clement* himself.

Edit. of the *Comment.* Bib. Patr. Tom. I. p. 1235. Ed. Secund.

These later works of *Clemens*, together with a *Hymn*, not before published, are collected in a late Edition at *Oxford*, MDCLXXXIII.

XXI. *Recognitionum L. X. ad Jacob Fratrem Domini*, translated by *Ruffinus*, and by him dedicated to one *Gaudentius*. I do not suppose it to be the genuine work of *Clemens Romanus* whose name it bears; for it is certainly later than *Bardesanes Syrus*, a discourse of whose quoted from him by *Eusebius Pr. Evang.* L. VI. c. 10. is here transcribed at large; and yet considerably antienter than *Origen*, *Philocal.* by whom it is attributed to *Clemens Romanus* himself, which is the reason why I place it about this time. The time I have fixed between A. D. 218. and 231. Diss. VI. ad *Iren.* n. 11. Cent. 2. near the *end.*

Edit. Colon. Agrippin. MDLXIX. by *Lambert Gruterus*. And in *Cotelerius*.

XXII. *Acta Felicitatis & Perpetuæ.* Cent. 3. *beg.*

Edit. *Paris.* by *Holstenius*. 8°. MDCLXIV. And at *Oxford*.

XXIII. *Tertullianus*: undoubted. Cent. 2. near the *end* and 3. *beg.*

De Pallio.

Apologeticus.

De Testimonio Animæ.

Ad Scapulam.
De Oratione.
Ad Martyras.
De Spectaculis.
De Idololatriâ.
De Habitu Muliebri.
De cultu Fœminarum.
Ad Uxorem suam L. II.
De Coronâ Militis.
De velandis Virginibus.
Ad Nationes, L. II. first published by *Jacobus Gothofredus* in 4o. *Genev.* MDCXXV. and therefore not to be expected in former Editions.
Adversus Judæos.
De Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos.
De Baptismo.
Adversus Hermogenem.
Adversus Valentinianos.
De Anima.
De Carne Christi.
De Resurrectione Carnis.
De Fugâ in Persecutione.
De Pudicitiâ.
De Patientiâ.
Adversus Marcionem, L. V.
Scorpiacen adversus Gnostikos.
Adversus Praxeam.
De Exhortatione Castitatis.
De Monogamiâ.
De Jejunio adversus Psychicos.

Edit. by *Rigaltius* rather than any other, because of the improvement of that most antient noble MS. of *Agobardus.* Or if you would have a Protestant Edition and of an easier price, get that of *Franeker*, 1592. rather than many others, though later.

Books

Books probably his, or of some other near his Age.

De Pœnitentiâ.

Edit. as aforesaid.

L. *Carmin. adv. Marcion. Lib. V.*

Genesis. }
Sodoma. }

These Monsieur *Alux de Vit. & Script. Tertul. c. ult.* suspects to have been written in later times, and names the very Authors he ascribes them to.

Ad Senatorem conversum.

These three last are in Verse, and are usually extant both among *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian's Works*, being ascribed to both of them.

Books conjectured by *Erasmus* to be his, from the likelinesS of their Style.

Ad amicum ægrotum.

De verâ Circumcisione.

Extant Tom. IV. of St. *Hierom's* Works.

Edit. Basil. MDLHI. the former at pag. 36. the later at pag. 119.

XXIV. *Epistola de Cibis Judaicis.*

Not *Tertullian's*, though ascribed to him; but of some *Bishop*, who probably flourished about this time. Some think of *Novatian* the *Schismatic.* Cent. 3. *beg.*

Edit. with *Tertullian* as aforesaid.

XXV. *Oratio adversus Græcos* inscripta *Contra Platonem. De Universi causâ.* Cent. 3 *beg.*

A *Fragment* of it published by *David Hæschelius* in his Notes upon *Photius's Bibliotheca*, Ad. p. 15. by him attributed to a *Christian Josephus*, by our *Primate Usher* to *Caius*, about *Alexander* the Emperors time. But in the Catalogue of *Hyppolytus's* Works found Ingraven on the same Stone with his *Paschal Canon*, it is

 reckoned

reckoned for *Hippolytus's*. Perhaps it was a part of *Irenæus* Διαλέξεις. Diss. V ad *Iren.* n. 18. Whoever he was that was Author of it, he seems to have flourished within our Period, and to have been a *Platonizing Christian.*

Cent. 3. *beg.* XXVI. *Minucius Fœlix.*

His Octavius, undoubtedly his since discovered by *Fr. Balduin.*

Edit. Lugdun. Batav. MDCLII. with Notes.

Cent. 3. *beg.* XXVII. *Hippolytus Bishop* and *Martyr*, commonly called *Portuensis*, if they be the same. Whether they were or no, yet they seem to have flourished about the same time, and have the same works indiscriminately ascribed to them. Such are.

De Antichristo, & consummatione Mundi, though questioned by several, yet most probably genuine, seeing it is mentioned as such by St. *Hierome de Script. Eccl.* whose Authority I conceive alone sufficient to countervail all those suspicions, rather than arguments, urged against it from the matter. Edit. in *Combefisii* Auctario, and by *Gudius*, that is another ascribed to him, but probably not his.

Edit. Bibliothec. Patr. Græco-Latin. Tom. ii. p. 342.

Canon Paschalis not doubted that I know of.

Edit. Joseph Scalig. Lugd. Batav. MDXCV.

Books probably his.

De Deo trino & uno & de Mysterio Incarnationis, contra hæresim Noëti.

Edit. Gerard. Vossii in miscell. Sanctor. Patrum ad fin. *Gregor. Thaumaturg.* p. 58.

De Theolog. & Incarnatione, contra Beronem & Helicem hæreticos.

Edit. Henr. Canisii Tom. V. Antiq. Lect. Part. 1. p. 153.

Both

Both of these, if his, are probable to have been Fragments of his work *against Heresies* mentioned by the *Ancients*.

Demonstratio contra Judæos.

Edit. Possevin. Apparat. verb. *Hippolytus.*

XXVIII. *Ammonius Alexandrinus* the Master of *Origen.* Undoubted. Cent. 3. *beg.*

Canon, or *Harmonia Evangelica* mistaken by *Victor Capuanus* for *Tatianus's Diatessaron.*

Edit. under the name of *Tatiani's*, Bibl. Patr. *Colon. Agrip.* MDCXVIII. Tom. 2. p. 183.

XXIX. *Origenes Adamantius.* His undoubted works. Cent. 3. *beg. mid.*

1. Such as are extant in *Greek.*

Cont. Celsum. Lib. viii.

Philocalia, Fragments collected out of his Works by St. *Basil.* and St. *Gregory.*

Edit. Cantabrig. by Mr. *Spencer*, MDCLVIII.

Comment on St. Matth. *and on St.* Joh. *New.*

Commentaries on Jerem. formerly published by the the name of St. *Cyrill.* of *Alexandria*, restored to *Origen*, together with several parts of *Philocalia* distributed according to the Scriptures to which they relate, *&c.*

Edit. in 2 vol. fol. by *Petr. Dan. Huetius*, together with large and learned *Prolegomena.*

Exhortatio ad Martyrium.

Responsio ad Africanum de Historiâ *Susannæ* integra cum Epistolâ *Africani.*

Edit. Basil. MDCLXXIV. by *Wetstenius.*

We may, I hope ere long, expect more of his Tractates in *Greek* in an *Edition* by themselves by the same *Huetius*, Περὶ Εὐχῆς at *Oxford*, MDCLXXXVI.

2. Such as are extant in *Latine*, in 2 Tomes, according to *Genebrard*'s Edition, MDCIV.

Genuine in Tom. 1.

In Genes. Hom. xvii.

In Exod. Hom. xiii.

In Levitic. Hom. xvi. though formerly attributed to St. *Cyrill*, yet undoubted since their restitution.

In Josue Hom. xxvi.

Hom. ii. in Cantic. Canticorum, interpret. S. *Hieronymo.*

In Isaiam Hom. ix.

In Jeremiam Hom. xiv.

In Ezechielem Hom. xiv.

Περὶ ἀρχῶν *L. iv.*

Genuine in Tom. 2.

In Lucam Hom. xxxix.

In Epist. ad Roman. Lib. xxxvi.

Cont. Celsum L. viii.

Philocalia collected, as aforesaid, out of his Works,

Epist. ad Jul. Affrican.

Other works probably his, and only doubted of because of the Liberty taken by *Ruffinus* in translating them, of adding frequently interpolations of his own.

In Num. Hom. xxviii.

In Judic. Hom. ix.

In Lib. Regnor. Hom. i.

Hom. in Ps. xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii.

In Cantic. Canticor. Hom. iv. cum Prolog.

In divers. Hom. i. iii, iv, v, vi, ix, x.

Note that learned Men do not rely so confidently on any thing translated by *Ruffinus*, because of the difficulty of distinguishing the *Original Text* from his *Interpolations.*

Wastenius

Wetstenius thinks the *Dialogue* against the *Marcionites* to be really *Origen*'s; others, among whom I profess my self to be one, conceive it only *personated*. Let the Reader judge of his Reasons.

Edit. Græco-Latin. by *Wetstenius* at *Basil*, as aforesaid.

XXX. *Julius Affricanus. His Epistle to Origen concerning the story of* Susanna, undoubted. Cent. 3. *beg.*

Edit. with *Origen*'s Answer to him, in *Greek* in *Wetstenius* as aforesaid.

A great part of his Chronography extant in *Georg. Syncellus Edit. Paris.* MDCLII. from whence, not being then published, it was borrowed by *Scaliger* in his *Edition* of *Eusebius*'s *Chronicon* in *Greek*.

XXXI. *Anonymus Chronologus* in the 13*th* of *Alexander Scoerus*, that is, A. D. CCXXXV. Ed. *Canis.* Lict. Antiq. and in *Labbæus*'s Bibliothec. MSS. Tom. I. A. D. MDCLVII.

XXXII. *Gregorius Thaumaturgus.* His undoubted Works: Cent. 3. *mid.*

Charisteria or *Panegyric. ad Origen.* Græco Latin.

Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten, extant only in *Latine*.

Epistola Canonica in *Latine* only in *Vossius*, but in *Greek* also in *Balsamon*, *Edit. Græco-Latin.* Parisis, MDCXX. p. 902.

His Confession of Faith recited by St. *Gregory Nyssen* in his life, as revealed to him by St. *John Baptist* Græco Latin.

Such as cannot be easily disproved:

De Animâ ad Tatianum.

In Annunciationem B. Virginis, Sermones iii.

Sermo in S. Theophaniâ.

Edit. of them all by *Gerard. Vossius* Præpos. Tungrens. Mogunt. MDCIV.

XXXIII.

Cent. 3. *mid.* XXXIII. *Cornelius Romanus*, undoubted.

Two Epistles to St. Cyprian, among St. Cyprians Epistles, XLVI, XLVII.

Ep. ad Lupicinum Edit. among *Blondell's* Ep. Pont. doubtful.

Cent. 3. bef. *mid.* XXXIV. A barbarous *Paschal Epistle* of this time A. D. 243. among St. *Cyprians* Works, Ed. *Oxford.*

Cent. 3. *mid.* and after. XXXV. *Cyprianus Carthag.* His undoubted Works.

All the Epistles, LXXXIII. according to *Pamelius's* distribution, who has placed them according to the time wherein they were written, are certainly his, and the other Authors, to whom they are inscribed.

De Disciplinâ & habitu Virginum.

De Lapsis.

De Unitate Ecclesiæ.

De Oratione Dominicâ.

Contra Demetrianum.

De Vanitate Idolorum.

De Mortalitate.

De bono Patientiæ.

De Opere & Eleemosynis.

De Zelo & Livore.

Books most probably thought his, and thought certainly to be so by *Pamelius.*

Libri III. Testimoniorum ad Quirinum, quoted by St. *Hierome.*

De Exhortatione Martyrij.

De laude Martyrij ad Moysem & Maximum & cæteros Confessores.

De Spectaculis.

De Disciplinâ & bono Pudicitiæ.

Ad Novatianum hæreticum, quòd Lapsis spes veniæ non sit deneganda.

Books, if not his, yet certainly of ancient Authors about his time.

De singularitate Clericorum.

De Aleatoribus.

De montibus Sinâ & Sion.

Adversùs Judæos qui insecuti sunt Dominum nostrum.

Edit. S. Goulartij MDXCIII. Or rather that of *Oxford* MDCLXXXII. where the Works are ordered according to their time, according to the Excellent *Annals* of the most learned *Pearson* Bishop of *Chester.* Besides *Nigaltius*'s Notes are most of them taken in by Bishop *Fell*, who has also collated many *MSS.* and added his own learned *Notes*, and some intire Discourses among the ungenuine Works, not before published.

The Names of Authors whose certainly genuine Works are extant among St. *Cyprian*'s, for the direction of young Students, who might otherwise meet them quoted, and not know where to find them.

Donati Ep. I. somewhat doubted of.

Cleri Romani ad Clerum Carthaginiensem, Ep. III. ad Cyprianum Ep. XXX, XXXI.

Confessorum universorum ad Cyprianum, de pace Lapsis danda Ep. XVII.

Caldonij ad Cyprianum Ep. XIX. Ad Clerum Carthag. Ep. XXXIX.

Celerini ad Luceanum Ep. XXI.

Luciani ad Celerinum. Ep. XXII.

Mysis & Maximi & cæterorum ad Cyprianum Rescript. Ep. XXVI. L.

Synodi African. ad Cornelium, Ep. LIV.

Firmilian. ad Cyprianum Ep. LXXV.

Nemesiani ad Cyprianum, Resp. Ep. LXXVII. Lucij

The Epistles are numbered according to Pamelius.

— *Lucij P. ad Cyprian. Resp. Ep. LXXIX.*

— *Felicis & cæterorum ad Cyprianum Resp. Ep. LXXX.*

— *Concilium Carthaginiense sub Cypriano*, concerning *Rebaptization of Hæreticks.*

Cent. 3. aft. *mid.* XXXVI. *Pontius Diaconus. His life of St. Cyprian*, undoubted.

Edit. with St. *Cyprians* Works as aforesaid.

Cent. 3. aft. *mid.* XXXVII. *An Author* about that time *against Rebaptization of Hæreticks.*

Edit. among the Notes of *Rigaltius*, in his *Edition* of St. *Cyprian.* & at the end of the Conf. Cyprian.

Cent. 3. aft. *mid.* XXXVIII. *Dionysius Alexandrinus.* His undoubted Works.

Epist. Canonica ad Basiliden.

Edit. with *Balsamon* on him, apud *Balsamon. Edit.* as aforesaid, p. 879. and Pandect. *Oxoniens.*

Ep. adversùs Paulum Samosatenum, translated by *Turrian.*

Edit. Græco-Latin. MDCVII.

Latin. Bibl. Patr. *Colon. Agrip.* Tom. iii. p. 67.

Cent. 3. aft. *mid.* XXXIX. *Methodius* Bishop of *Olympus*, and afterwards of *Tyre*, commonly called *Patarensis* by the *Greeks.* Undoubted Works.

Excerpta ex Libr. de Resurrectione.

Ex Lib. de Creatis.

Ex Lib. de Symposiis.

Ex Lib. contr. Porphyrium, &c.

All these improved above what had been extant of them formerly in *Epiphanius*, *Photius* and *Damascen.*

Liber de Libero Arbitrio.

Oratio in Simeon & Annam.

Oratio in Ramos Palmarum, most probably his, tho by some formerly ascribed to St. *Chrysostom.*

Edit.

Edit. Fr. Combefis cum *Amphilochio*, &c. Græco-Lat. *Paris. MDCXLIV.*

XL. *De Trinitate*, a work ascribed by some to *Tertullian*, by others to *Novatian* the Heretick; but of an Author later than either of them, being certainly after the rise of *Sabellius* the Heretick, whom he mentions, and yet in all probability before *Arianism*. *Sabellius* rose A. D. 257. Diss. ad *Iren.* VI. §. 25. Cent. 3. near the end.

Edit. with *Tertullian*, as aforesaid.

XLI. Fragm. *Disputationis Archelai Episcopi Mesopotamiæ adv. Manichæum.* Cent. 3. end.

Edit. by *Hen. Valesius* in the end of his Notes on *Socrates* and *Sozomen.*

XLII. *Anatolii Episcopi Laodiceni de Canone Paschali.*

Ed. in *Bucher.* Doctrin. Tempor.

XLIII. *Arnobius Afer.* undoubted. Cent. 3. end.

L. VII. *contra Gentes.*

Edit. Lugd. Batavor. MDCLI. with Notes.

XLIV. *Lactantius Firmianus*: undoubted. Cent. 3. end. 4. beg.

Divin. Instit. L. VII.

De Irâ Dei.

De Opificio Dei.

Epitome in Libros suos.

Edit. Lugdun. Batavor. MDCLX. by *Servatus Gallæus.*

De Mortib. Persecutor.

Edit. by *Baluz. Miscell. Lib.* 2. *Paris. MDCLXXIX.* And in the *Oxford* Edition of *Lactantius's* Works. And alone at *Oxford*, and elsewhere.

XLV. *Petrus Alexandrinus*: undoubted: Cent. 3. end. 4. beg.

Epistol. Canonica.

Edit. Balsamon. p. 887.

XLVI. *Pamphilus Martyr.* Cent. 3. end. 4. beg.

Apologia

Apologia pro Origene, I verily believe genuine, notwithstanding what St. *Hierome* objects against it. For *Eusebius* himself pretends the assistance of *Pamphilus* in his writing that *Apology* of his, *Hist. Eccl. L. VI. C. 26. Lat. xy. Græc. Edit. Christophorson*, and it is observed by *Photius*, *Cod. CXVIII.* who tells us, That the first V Books had the assistance of *Pamphilus*, the VI only after his Martyrdom composed by *Eusebius* alone; so that the contrary testimony of *Eusebius* produced by St. *Hierome*, that *Phamphilus* wrote nothing but some few *Epistles*, if it were rightly quoted (for it does not appear, I think in *Eusebius* as extant at present) was in all likelihood to be understood of such Works as he alone was Author of whereas in this he had the Assistance of *Eusebius* himself. This is the only objection insisted on by St. *Hierome*. Out of St. *Hierome* it appears, that this was only the first Book of those V. wherein it appears from *Photius*, that *Eusebius* had the assistance of *Pamphilus*; so that it seems that this alone was selected by *Rufinus* out of the whole work, because this, as it should seem, was alone employed in vindication of the Opinions of *Origen*, the rest, as may be conjectured from their Contents mentioned in *Photius*; spent in a Historical Elogy, and vindication of his life. I have the more particularly insisted on this, and given my reason why I believe it genuine, because the Authority of St. *Hierome* has swayed the generality of the learned World in this particular.

It may be he had it from his III. Books *de vita Pamphili* now lost.

Edit. Usually in *Origen* and St. *Hierom*'s Works.

Note, That for the understanding and judging of these Authors and their Works, it would be very expedient

expedient to read the *Ecclesiastical History* of *Eusebius*, where also many more considerable *Fragments* of the Authors already mentioned, and several others not mentioned, will be found very well worthy perusal in order to the design intended.

Letter

---

pendant to read the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, where all many more considerable Fragments of the Author already mentioned, and several other not mentioned, will be found very well worthy perusal, under such a design intended.

Lector

Letter II.

A Letter of Advice for direction of a young Student *in* Divinity, *especially such as is* Rational, *related to in the former*, Numb. XVII.

SIR,

I. I Am sorry that your bashfulness has hitherto denied me the more familiar opportunities of your acquaintance during your residence among us; but am withal glad that these present disadvantageous circumstances themselves of time and place have now at length, though unexpectedly, emboldened your Modesty to such a *welcome*, and *never-unseasonable*, motion. But neither the interest of friendship, nor my own inclination, nor the I.

the copiousness of the subject wherein you have imployed me, nor my little leasure for things so insignificant, will permit me to retaliate your Complements; and therefore, I hope, you will excuse me though I be abrupt in my addresses to the resolution of your proposal. And that I may avoid that generality and unpracticableness and obscurity to which immethodical Discourses are very obnoxious; and may contrive my thoughts in as few words and as little time as the ordinary frequent avocations of my other Studies will allow me, and withal more usefully and distinctly to your purpose: I conceive it most convenient to shew, First, *the design of Scholastical Divinity, and the general requisites thereunto*; and thence, Secondly, *the more particular influence of Secular Learning in order to it*; and Thirdly, *some few books to initiate you herein, and general directions that are adviseable in your studies of them*; and Lastly, *the order wherein I conceive them most successfully intelligible*; in prosecution of which method you will have, not only my *Council*, but my Reasons, which I most willingly submit to your censure to be followed or rejected as you shall find them more or less convincing.

II. For

II. For the first, that I may prevent a mistake which I believe you will be ready to take up because of the ordinary signification of the term, it will be necessary to forewarn you, that by *Scholastical Divinity* I do not intend that only which is rigorously so called, but more largely all, wherein there is required skill for the deduction of inferences; whether for the resolution of *Controversies*, or *doubts of Conscience*; as it comprehends that which is *Textuary* as well as what is *purely Rational* in opposition to that which is *Practical* and *Inartificial*, as *Oratory*. For concerning this later, affectation being a vice most repugnant to its end, which is serious persuasion; and to which Scholars are usually too much addicted for this very reason of their too Critical observations of the Rules of *Art*; I conceive it most expedient that it be contrived as *natural* as is possible, to which it will be necessary that all things which may have an influence on your particular end be prudently considered, your *Subject*, and your *Auditory*, and your own *Genius*, and your very manner of delivery, to which every thing may so agree as if they had been your only incentives, and what you said had been without any *deliberation*; and to II.

this purpose though you may read ancient and late Authors that are respectively commended in their kind, I should not advise you the imitation of any particularly, but let your own disposition chuse for itself without any designed reflections. But this only by way of digression, though I believe pardonable, because possibly pertinent to your purpose. *Scholastical Divinity* in the sense now explained is that which I conjecture more principally intended by you; and to which I shall therefore confine my future discourse. Its design therefore being for the clearing of such propositions as, although they be necessary for faith or practice, yet their evidence depends upon the explication of such terms and the inferring of such consequences, as are not obviously intelligible by the vulgar: the most convenient way for determining the requisites of this will be by shewing the nature of those Principles from whence it deduceth its particular Conclusions. For whatever is requisite for understanding the true sense of them, must also be so to the certainty of their *Illations*; and therefore Religion *objectively* taken being *a Revelation of the Divine Will as the measure of ours, whereby we may be competently informed of our duty in*

order

order to happineſs; the difference of theſe Principles which are *per ſe nota* in their kinds muſt ariſe from the different Lights under which they are manifeſted, that matters concerning Religion are diſcovered by a *ſupernatural Divine Light* as exceeding that of our *natural Reaſon*, the only meaſure of all our *natural knowledge*. Which yet is not to be underſtood, as ſome dangerouſly conceive of the *light of the faculty*, as if *Reaſon* were not able certainly and evidently to know the *Credibility*, at leaſt, of what is ſo propounded; nor of the *light* of the *formal object* of *aſſent*, as if the *Reaſon* of *Credibility*, at leaſt, were not always proportioned to the faculty (which if it were not, it were both impoſſible to be diſcerned, and unſafe to be aſſented to, ſeeing many things may, and do, very falſly *pretend* to ſuch a Title of Credibility on account of unknown reaſons) but rather in regard of the *material object*, the thing it ſelf which is to be believed, which ſometimes has a *natural connexion* with the *formal*, and ſometimes only by *voluntary inſtitution*. For ſo, that I may clear my mind by an inſtance, when we know *God* from the *Creatures*, this whole *Light* is *natural*, not only in regard of the *faculty*, nor of the *creatures*

which have a *natural proportion* to it, but alſo of the naturally-dependent connexion of the Creatures on God, who is known by them. But when we know the *Trinity* from *Divine Revelation* propounded by *Men*, and atteſted by *Miracles*, although both of them are natural in the two former ſenſes; yet neither this human propoſition, nor theſe atteſting miracles, have any natural or neceſſary connection with the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, which is propounded as credible by them; but with the *ſupernatural Will* of the *Divine Proponent*, upon which account alſo this *Light*, in relation to this object, is called *ſupernatural*. Theſe things though poſſibly as yet you may not ſee the uſe of, yet hereafter you may perceive to remove the very material miſunderſtandings of moſt *School-men* in this queſtion, and to be very fundamental to what we ſhall hereafter adviſe conſequentially to theſe Principles.

III. III. SEEING therefore that from hence it appears in general that the *light of the faculty* is abſolutely neceſſary for the improving all that is *objective*, whether *natural* or *ſupernatural*; I conceive it very convenient to exerciſe frequently your diſcurſive faculty in *Theſes* upon ſome *difficult Queſtion* which you may meet with in your

your ſtudies, and eſpecially in ſuch as are *intricate* and *ſubtle*; for theſe will beſt enable you to conceive a right in others of a like nature, though of a different matter. And if you chooſe Subjects free from intereſt on either ſide (ſuch as are many of the School-Diſputes) how uſeleſs ſoever they might ſeem for their own ſake, yet you might gain this very great advantage by them, thus to inure your ſelf to an unprejudiced way of reaſoning, and to manage your Argument without Paſſion or Perſonal Reflections on your Adverſary. The time for this, if you ſhall think fit to deſign a particular one, were I believe fitteſt in the *Morning*, when the Spirits are more clear and ſubtle, and your thoughts more compoſed, and ſo every way more apt for *Contemplation*. In the performing hereof I would not have you inſiſt on your Authors method (For which purpoſe it were well your morning-Theſis concerned a Queſtion you had ſtudied the Night before) but rather endeavour upon full deliberation of what has been produced for both opinions, to deliver your own conceptions, and to exerciſe your own invention as much as is poſſible; and withal in your method, not to mind only the *private concernment* of the difficulty you are then

handling, but alſo the *general* of others of the ſame kind, ſo as that your experience in this may capacitate you for others: as to conſider the *true ſenſe* of the *terms*, if there be any material ambiguity that is ſuſpicious of being miſunderſtood by the contradicting Parties; but not to ſpend time on them when they are obvious and trivial, and of none or little moment for determining the principal Queſtion; and then faithfully to enquire into the true ſtate of the Queſtion, which you were not to think you underſtand, and ſo not to define your own thoughts concerning it, before you have firſt candidly examined the true ſenſe of both *Adverſaries*, the want of which you will find to be an original of moſt of thoſe *Logomachyes* which are ſo frequent in the *Schools*, and I believe generally received in very many of thoſe Controverſies which divide the *Communion* of whole Churches; whence it proceeds that many of the arguments of both Parties need no other ſolution than the clearing of their Adverſaries meaning, which being once performed, they are found impertinent and unconcluſive. And for the attaining of this I would not have you rely on violent *Bigots*, or the followers of Factions, who ſpeak only by roat, and beſides the deſign

and

and reasons of their Masters, and are *resolved*, nay and many times *obliged*, to defend them in whatever they say, though never so *Paradoxical*, and are frequently put to their shifts to invent defensible glosses, how expressly soever the Author has explained his meaning, and where he is the least obscure, are much more favourable to what is more easily defensible; nor on the bare words of the first Authors, it being ordinary for Controvertists to *overspeak* themselves, and to bring in many things *ex abundanti*, which though they might think *probably true*, yet might well be spared without prejudice of their cause; and much less from the partial relations of their Adversaries: but rather from the rise and occasion of the Question, from the design and disposition of themselves and their Adversaries. Where, if on either side you will allow any thing for violence, you will have more reason to suspect it of the *latter Assailant* than the *first Proponent*, who, no Adversary appearing, may reasonably be presumed to have delivered his mind with less design, and more simplicity; and from the connexion with their other Principles. And never satisfie your self of your success in this enquiry till you have found out some great verisimilitude that might very

very plausibly perswade a judicious and ingenuous Man to your Adversaries opinion, if swayed with his prejudices; for it is hard to be so generally uncharitable as to believe that there are not some such that maintain all much received Opinions. And to this purpose I conceive it very convenient that you be conversant with other Works of the Author from whom you dissent, that you may thence perceive what principles he does *otherwise* much rely on, and what his *moral disposition* is, for this may be very effectual for swaying him when the main Arguments used are *Popular* and *Declaratory*; and of that nature are most of those Questions which divide great and numerous Ecclesiastical Societies, as were easie to instance and evince if I were not afraid of being tedious. When you have thus gained the *true sense* and *use* of the Question, your nearer approaches to its resolution you may make in this order: First to consider the nature of the prejudices, for though in some cases they may contribute, yet they are never to be the only motives for determining your assent; and therefore you are to see that First, they never hinder you from embracing a contrary evidence *more convincing* than that on which themselves are grounded; nor

nor Secondly, from *impartially considering* the force of that which does only pretend it, though in the event it do not prove so; but only Thirdly, when upon full enquiry you find the contrary but equally probable with what you do at present believe, there you may securely submit your self to providence, that has placed you in such circumstances as thus incline you rather than hazard your present peace for an *only-equal* contentment in the contrary; so that it be done *modestly*, without any censorious reflections on such as dissent from you; and that you would consider what the Prejudices on both sides are distinctly, and if you find your self partially affected to either of them, there to be cautious that it do not betray you to any thing unreasonable. And in general, for the avoiding of them all, I conceive it very adviseable that you be not too prodigal in uttering your thoughts concerning any Theological Question of moment before a multitude with any concernedness and vehemence, before you have first examined it by these forementioned Prescriptions. After this, for the most faithful discovery of the *nature* and *force* of the *proofs*, you should distinguish from their *differences* those things wherein both parties

ties are *agreed*, and on which as on *common Principles* they ground their arguments. For these you will find to be of very great use for judging the particulars, unto the which, if you be satisfied with them, you may descend more closely, assuring your self that, however their opinions may, yet it is impossible that their reasons should be really contrary: That you may therefore find distinctly how far they are conclusive, and to whether opinion they are more favourable; it were well that First omitting that multitude of particular ones that are produced for both, the whole force were summ'd up in one *a priori*; wherein you might at one view perceive the whole series of their *principles*: and then that you divide them into so many *Propositions*, disposed in the order wherein they follow from each other, which when you have done, you may then examine First, the absolute truth of these principles distinctly; and Secondly, their consequence from each other; and then Thirdly, the truth of these premisses relatively: what sense is requisite to be true that these consequences may be inferred from them; and whether they be indeed true in these particular senses that are requisite; and by these means you will most

pro-

probably find the true and faithful measure of discerning how far they are conclusive, which you may then compare with the true sense of the contrary Opinion as you have formerly explained it, and so of the contrary proofs with this, and as you find them exactly agreeing so you may determine. These Rules I have the more particularly insisted on, because, as they are rarely taken notice of, and more rarely observed by our modern *Controvertists*, so, to me they seem the most *successful* for the avoiding those mistakes and fallacies which are too frequent among them; for by this means you will more probably understand the Question, your proofs will be more directly levelled against your Adversary, and his main objections will be supposed resolved before you are determined, and for others which stand in need of more particular answers (they being weaker) you may be less solicitous. Nor do I think of all these necessary in all questions to be distinctly considered, but principally for the most important ones of Divinity; and some, at least, to be necessary to all of what nature soever; and that such regard be had of those which are not, that before you neglect them you be assured that they are indeed *impertinent*,

nent. And in the management of the whole, especially where you do endeavour *self-satisfaction*, it were well you were as *brief* as *clear*, as *distinct* and as *methodical* as is possible.

IV. IV. HAVING thus shewn you the form of managing reason in general, I believe you do expect that I should descend particularly to direct your Studies that you may be furnished with materials. And this I shall attempt in pursuance of my formerly designed method, in both those kinds of *Principles*, by which, as I said, all *Theological Controversies* are to be determined. For the first, those which are *rational*, I would recommend that too-much decried Study among most *Protestants* of *School-Divinity*. For considering that the very foundations and principles of all Religion are *natural*; considering further that all supernatural Revelations are but *accessory Complements* to these, where Nature was *actually debauched*, or *originally insufficient*, but never undertake to give a *compleat digest* of them; considering also that accordingly the Scriptures do either not mention them at all, or where they do, yet not *professedly*, but upon occasion of others; and then it self they are rather *supposed* than prescribed, or, where

where *prescribed*, yet rather as to the *circumstances* of their exercise, than as to their *moral* and *universal obligation*: It plainly follows that here, *Reason* is wholly left even by God himself to the evidence of its own inquiry. And this not only as to those particulars which are so plain and obvious as that they even offer themselves without inquiry, and it is impossible to be ignorant of them without a *gross negligence*, or a *resolved obstinacy*; but such wherein some great Philosophers themselves have been mistaken. Such was the *universal Providence of God over Mankind*, which not only *Epicurus*, but, for any thing that I know, the *Jews* themselves, did hardly believe, by whom we find God's care of the Salvation of the *Gentiles* admired at as a (*m*) *strange* and incredible thing, and a great argument of his not being an (*n*) *accepter of persons*, as it seems they had thought before. And their most favourable sentiments concerning them seem to have been, that God had indeed appointed (*o*) *Tutelary Angels* for other Nations, but that himself was their own *President*; that their own Souls only were (*p*) *immortal*, and that none others had any portion in the *World to come*; that therefore their *Proselytes* were truly *tran-*

(*m*) Act. xi. 18.

(*n*) Act. x. 34.

(*o*) *Rab. Israel* de Anim. c. xxv.

(*p*) *Buxtorf.* Synagog. Judaic. c. 8. p. 25.

(q) *Rab. Is.* Disp. Cab. de Anim. c. 21. & ibid. *Jos. Voysin.* in Not. D. *Hammond* on S. John iii. 5.
(r) John iii. 3.
(s) ib. v. 5. 6.
(t) ib. v. 10.

(q) *transubstantiate*, whence those phrases of being (r) *born again*, and (s) *of the Spirit*, wherein our Saviour wonders at the ignorance of (t) *Nicodemus*, as being notorious among the *Rabbins*. Yet the whole *Old-Testament* seems so particularly designed for their *Common-wealth*, as that they have little occasion for mentioning God's Providence over other *Nations*. Nor is it only in such instances as these which are primarily concerning all Nations, and therefore, at least, till the times of the New-Testament, discoverable only by that Light which was alone common to all Nations, that the Scriptures are not so designedly particular as to supersede the necessity of natural enquiries; but especially also in *secondary* instances of the Law of *Nature*. Which though it appears that they have been for time and place dispensed with, and therefore their universally-obliging reason being more *circumstantial*, is *less easily discernible*; yet their severe penalties without any new *positive* prohibition, and their having been looked on as *abominable* in the very *Gentiles*, shew that the Church reputed them unlawful for this very reason of their being thus against secundary Laws of Nature. Such are the Questions of *Polygamy*, of *marrying the Bro-*

Brothers Relict, and of *Usury*, and other instances wherein I believe I should not be unwarrantably confident if, notwithstanding what others have endeavoured concerning them, I should say that they cannot be clearly disproved by any particular prohibition in the *New Testament*. And the way of propounding those which are *moral*, and those which are not, in the *Old Testament*, being general and indefinite; and the *New* one never descending to tell us what *particulars* were temporary, but only, in *general*, teaching us that what was *Typical* must needs disappear at the *real* exhibition of what it *signified*, and that all *accommodations* even in what otherwise was *moral*, must now under *larger Grace*, and *greater Means*, and *clearer Revelations*, in all reason be evacuated; the only way of determining here any thing particularly must be, omitting all *Testimonies*, to examin the nature of the *Precepts* themselves, and thence to discern whether the *reason* of their obligation be *Temporary* or *Eternal*. To which I may add, that many *Counsels* are urged in the *Scriptures*, many things in compliance to the *present Circumstances*, and some indulgences to *present prejudices* even in the *New Testament*, and this without particular provisi-

on for future obſervance, which are not any other way diſtinguiſhable but by *Reaſon*. And of the ſame neceſſity it is for all *Caſes of Conſcience*, and many other emergent difficulties which you will frequently encounter in the practiſe of Divinity. It were alſo eaſie to ſhew how very uſeful Reaſon is for the moſt important controverſies that divide the *Communion of Chriſtendom*; and how its greateſt *Adverſaries*, thoſe of *Rome*, do ground themſelves mainly on it in their exigencies; as in *the neceſſity of a viſible Judge of Controverſies*, *in their detaining the Cup from the Laity*, which themſelves cannot deny to have been granted them in the firſt and pureſt Centuries, and in *the Doctrine of the Reſolution of Faith*. So alſo in the *Remonſtrant* and *Janſeniſt* opinions, in all Diſputes with the *Socinians*, and moſt with the *Sectaries*, which are ſuch inſtances wherein our Men prove it unreaſonable to expect particular proof from Scripture. The ſame, I think, might be proved concerning moſt of the definitions of the *Church* againſt the Enemies of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, as to particular expreſſions whereby ſhe diſowned their innovations, that they were grounded on theſe ſo Tragically declaimed againſt *Theological Reaſons*, if I were not affraid of being

being tedious. But in ſhort, if it be conſidered that hither all Controverſies are *finally* reſolved, even all *Authority* into the reaſon of its *credibility*; that all other ways of arguing are plauſibly excepted againſt by ſome *Parties*, but this cannot, there being no oppoſing it but by it ſelf, which is a *contradiction*; that this at length when all is done will be found moſt *ſatisfactory*, theſe will ſure be ſufficient prejudices to invite you, till you ſhall find ſomething as plauſible alledged for the contrary.

V. BUT in the Study of this *rational Divinity* I would not perſwade you to imitate the *Schools* themſelves any farther than as they are rational. For I muſt confeſs that one fundamental defect ſeems to me generally ingredient in their diſcourſes; that they ſeem rather to endeavour the *outwitting* of their *Adverſaries* than their own ſatisfaction. Which may be very ſuſpicious both from their making uſe of reaſons which themſelves confeſs unſufficient for the *conviction of Infidels*, which yet they take for *ſtrong Conſolations* of *Believers* (which might indeed be tolerable if the efficacy of ſuch proofs depended on any proper principles which were admitted by *Believers* and not by *Infidels*, but de- V.

pending on pure *Philosophical* Reasons, as most of these do, which are produced by *Aquinas*, who speaks for them *L.* 1. *Cont. Gent. c.* 9. they seem less excusable) but principally their determining the *Question* by, and conforming their reasons to, some *Authority* and that sometimes very contemptible; as of some *Heathen Philosophers*, or *late Doctors*, or at the uttermost *particular Fathers* (for they seldom meddle with *Councils*) and their laying too much stress upon their very *forms of speaking*, though not mentioned in the *Scriptures*, to the very decision of *Articles of Faith*, as, I think, might easily be proved in the Question concerning *the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son* against the *Greeks*, nay often on their very *mystical expositions*, without the least examination of their *design*, or *sense*, or *credibility*. Nor is it needful to mind you how very unsufficient they had been for it though they had attempted it; partly because of their ignorance in the *Greek Fathers*, and so being necessitated to rely on ignorant *Translations* for those they had (for *Greek* Learning was continually decaying in the *Latin Church* from the time of the removal of the *Empire*, and early but very remarkable

kable instance whereof (that I may not now particularize others) we have in that famous Cheat put upon the whole general Council of (*u*) *Ariminum* by *Valens* and *Ursacius* and some few other Eastern Bishops of reading ὁμοιούσιον for ὁμούσιον in the Decree of the *Nicæne Council*; but especially after the open breach betwixt the *Roman* and *Constantinopolitane Patriarchs*, whereby intelligence with the *Orientals* was exceedingly interrupted, long before the rise of the *Schoolmen*) but mainly because of their great unskilfulness in *Critical* Learning, to know their *original*, and their *sense* in other places, which yet had been necessary to their design. And therefore I should advise you to be more ingenuously rational then they are, in the proof of their *Principles* as well as in the inference of your *Conclusions*; That you do not strain your wit to make any Testimony defensible before you are otherwise convinced of its credibility, and at least let it not be as a principal motive of your determination; That you never trouble your self much with those reasons themselves which, as they are only propounded as probable, so they, are confessed to be unnecessary. But First, consider the nature of

(*u*) St. *Hieronym.* adv. *Luciferian.* & alij.

the Question, whether the Arguments, whereon the whole stress of its assent can only be surely grounded, and which if they be weak the definition cannot be certain, be *Reason*, or *Authority*; and if it be *Reason grounded on Authority* (as most of the *School-Questions* are) that then you urge the Reason no farther than the Authority will warrant you; and remember that a less Reason will suffice, when all the use of reason is for rendring the Conclusion it self *defensible*, for that proceeds on particular evidences whereby it appears to us, and therefore does not require a *real*, but *every way apparent*, credibility. But where the reasons grounded on these phrases and manners of expressing the Articles are drawn to the direct proof of its *real truth*, or are taken as Principles for the probation of others; it were then reasonable to have recourse to *Lombard*'s Text, and to examine First, whether that Doctrine be really taught by that Father, who is by him quoted for it? and Secondly, whether it be delivered by him as his own private opinion or as the sense of the Church? and whether dogmatically, or in heat of controversie? If as the sense of the Church, then Thirdly, what was the ground of it, whether the evidence of universal Tradition,

or

or æquivalencies in the Scriptures; or the general ſenſe only of the learned? And whether they took it up for the evidence of its proper reaſon, or originally from the Authority of ſome private Perſon, who was commended in theſe controverſies, and from whom it was derived by the reſt without any new examination? for in ſome of theſe things you will find moſt of *Lombard's* Principles to be deficient, they being for the much greater part tranſcribed from St. *Auguſtine*. But it may be a more direct way for knowing the rational modes of expreſſion, whereon the Church grounded her Arguments (in thoſe Articles which are generally and ſurely believed for Revelation, and wherein antient and univerſal Authority may be preſumed more ſecurely expreſſive of the genuine ſenſe of Tradition than our private reaſonings, as in the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*) will be by examining what principles of this kind are ſuppoſed in her diſcourſes with the *antient Hereticks* in the firſt general Councils, moſt of her definitions there being, as I formerly ſaid, grounded on *Theological reaſon*. And therefore I would adviſe you in general, before your particular enquiries, to ſatisfie your ſelf how far your reſolution is to be grounded on particular reaſon; that

ſo, if they ſhould fail, as they will certainly in many things which yet upon other accounts are very reaſonably credible) you may not preſently *condemn* the Concluſion as *ſimply falſe* becauſe of the falſhood of their improper principles. And what Queſtions are only determinable by *reaſon* you have ſeveral inſtances in the beginning of the former Paragraph.

VI. VI. BUT it remains, for the accompliſhment of this firſt part of my task, that I proceed to the ſecond ſort of principles, namely ſuch as are known by *Divine Revelation.* And here ſeeing the reſolution of no Parties is againſt the *plain words*, or at leaſt the *ſenſe*, of the Scriptures; and it is farther agreed that the bare Grammatical ſignification of the words is of no other force for expreſſing the Speakers mind than as it is ordinarily reaſonable to preſume that he intended this where there are not particular ſuſpitions of believing otherwiſe; Therefore for the bringing theſe things home to the deciſion of our preſent Controverſies, it will be requiſite to enquire Firſt, what ſenſe of them is æquivalent with the Concluſions to be proved by them? and Secondly, what reaſon there is to believe that this ſenſe was deſigned by the Speaker? And where this is ambiguous, and

and both of them ſeem applicable without abſurdity; the only way for determining which of them was intended by him muſt be by examining all thoſe things which may be ſuppoſed as notorious to the *Auditory* to whoſe underſtandings he was to accommodate himſelf, and what was only likely to prove efficacious in reference to his deſign. And though this latter be to be performed by *reaſon:* by examining their *miſapprehenſions*; and then conſidering what were in Prudence moſt proper for their *correction*, and which particular ſenſe is moſt rationally reducible to this deſign; Yet the former will be moſt ſatisfactorily reſolved by *Philological* Learning. I mean by enquiring how the ſame Author uſed the ſame expreſſion in other clearer parallel places? how the Auditors themſelves uſually underſtood it? And ſo to examine the *Idioms* either of the place or Country from other their contemporary Writers. And if the notoriouſneſs of the Speech depended on a matter of *Fact*, to which it alluded, and of which none of them could probably be preſumed ignorant; then the moſt ſure way both for underſtanding that particular phraſe and all other diſcourſes whatſoever of the ſame ſubject, will be by clearing the thing it ſelf, and pointing at thoſe in-

instances in allusion to which those expressions might have been occasioned, which had been otherwise unintelligible. And to this end you may more easily discern First, the necessity of the *Tongues* wherein they were originally written. For it is very possible, either by reason of the *affinity* or *homonymy*, or for want of answering words in the other Tongues, for *Translations* to be mistaken, at least, not to be so secure as to ground arguments, which may be very much endangered by the very uncautiousness of the expression. And Secondly of the *Idioms of those Tongues*, which are frequently occasions of mistakes in them that rely on Translations that render them *verbatim*, without considering their importance in the *Originals*, as is usual both in the reputed LXXII and the *vulgar Latin*, which were generally followed by the *Greek* and later *Latin* Fathers, and many perplexities might be instanced which are raised by them from thence, which have no difficulty in the Originals. And for this it will be convenient to be acquainted, not only with the sacred *Text* it self (which, especially in the *Old Testament*, are all the Records remaining of the purer ancient *Hebrew*, and therefore can give little light to the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα) but also with those tongues

tongues which seem at first derived from the *Hebrew* Tongue, as most of the *Orientals* are; but those especially into which it afterwards degenerated after the ruine of their Government, by reason of their mixture with other conquering Nations. Such was the *Chaldee*, on occasion of the *Babylonian* captivity, as appears from part of *Jeremy*, *Daniel* and *Ezra*, and those parts of the *Chaldee Paraphrases* which are truly inscribed to *Jonathan* and *Onkelos*; and *Syriack* in the time of our Saviour, as is observed by learned men from most of these *Hebrew words* mentioned in the *New Testament*, by mixture of the *Syro-Macedones* after the prevalency of the *Grecian Monarchy*. For in these, it seems more probable that the words which were afterwards imposed instead of the genuine *Hebrew* without any interruption where the things were practised, and whilst the Notions were fresh in memory, did more exactly answer them than those that wanted these advantages. And Thirdly, the *Idiomes of the Person* himself, of his wit, of his Country, of his education. For it is clear that the Style of the Scriptures is very different: either lofty, or low; or eloquent, or rational, in accommodation to the writers natural abilities. For thus the

the *New Testament* writers have many *Hebraisms*, and St. *Paul* some *Cilicianisms*, as you may find instanced by St. *Hierome ad Algas. Q.* 9. and *Origen on the Romans*. And these are of great moment both for varying the signification of the same phrases, and making them more or less accurately inelligible in grounding arguments on them. And Fourthly, *the Antiquities alluded to*. And these not only such as are *directly aimed at*, and with approbation, but also such as are *purposely opposed*. For thus *Maimonides* (*x*) conceives the rites of the *Zabii* very beneficial for giving light to many *positive Levitical* precepts, which now, for want of them, seem strange and impertinent. And it would doubtlessly much contribute to the clear *distinction* of those which were *moral* or *judicial*, grounded on *temporary* or *eternal reason*, to have known all the *Ceremonies* of the *Chaldæan* and *Phænician Idolatry*; though, I think there are no very great assistances for it in our now-extant writers, and what is related occasionally either by the credulous *Greeks*, or antient *Talmudists*, or the later *Arabians*, being exceedingly intermixed with fabulous and conjectural assertions, will need a very prudent and judicious sagacity to separate what is credible,

(x) *More Nebok.* Part. iii. c. 29. &c.

ble, from what is not ſo. But for what may be performed from our preſent aſſiſtances in this ſubject, I ſhall refer you to the excellent diſcourſe of our famous Antiquary *Mr. Selden de dijs Syris.* And for the better underſtanding of theſe, and the main deſign of Hiſtorical or Prophetical writers, and thoſe very conſiderable ſeeming differences even in the circumſtances of what is only upon ſeveral occaſions related in themſelves as well as in exotick Authors, and this not only in ſome frivoons inſtances, but in ſuch whereon depend the greateſt arguments for Religion; the accompliſhment of remarkable *promiſes* and *propheſies* whoſe truth was to warrant very conſiderable alterations, as in the *LXX years Captivity, and Daniel's week*, whence is derived one of the ſtrongeſt grounds of *Chriſtianity*; neither of which can be determined without the auxiliaries of the *Heathens*; I ſay for all theſe it will be neceſſary to ſtudy and compare their *Hiſtory*, and *Chronology*, and *Geogrophical* diſcriptions of thoſe Countries. And for the traditional doctrines of the Old Teſtament, becauſe the beſt means for their diſcovery ſeem to me to depend on ſecular learning, I ſhall therefore defer them to their proper place. In the mean time for particular and occaſio-

occasional expressions of the new, it were convenient to be acquainted with the first *Heresies*, and the conveyance of the traditional doctrines of the Church in their plain, and genuine, and unmixed practice, (which will be the best way of making them applicable to our present Controversies) will be most probably derivable from the Fathers of the immediately succeeding Centuries; which is the design I would have you principally aim at in reading them. And concerning those general Cautions to be observed in following them, I presume you have before your departure heard my thoughts in some of our *Colledg-exercises*; and therefore I shall not need to be large in them. Only in general, you may observe a vast difference betwixt what they deliver either as their *private thoughts*, or as a *generally-received opinion*, and what they assert as *the doctrin of the Catholick Church* delivered to them from the Apostles; and here it self betwixt what they *reputed* such from some judicial *inferences* of their own, and what they were more competent Judges of, in that pure *Historical* evidence which must have been obvious to them without any, or at least any *difficult*, *Illations*, and this with *Vincentius Lerinensis*'s Rules; in all times,

In *Commonit.*

times, all places, and all Ecclesiastical Societies, that were founded by Apostles or Apostolical persons. For in the former I then endeavoured to shew their fallibility from that unaccurate way of Arguing which prevailed generally among them; and those unsecure principles on which they relyed. Which though I then only touched, as willing to confine my discourse to the time allotted for it; yet possibly they might be of some use in your reading of the Fathers, inasmuch as that to some of them I believe you will find most of those errors which in many instances, by the Confession of all, prevailed in the first three Centuries, to be easily reducible. Other Rules were advisable for the discovery of these *Testimonial* from *Judicial* traditions, but because the mentioning of my own thoughts concerning them together with my reasons, would engage me in many and great Controversies which cannot possibly be dispatched in few words, and that I have already insensibly exceeded my first designed brevity, I forbear.

VII. AND now, concerning the second particular formerly propounded, namely the influence of secular learning in order to those mentioned designs of the *Study of Divinity*, I shall insist on the method VII.

thod already obſerved in that. And though it were eaſie by an induction in all human ſciences whatſoever, to ſhew this ſerviceableneſs; yet becauſe ſo large a task might poſſibly diſcourage you, as not being attainable in one life; and their uſefulneſs is very different in its degrees, ſome being only convenient, and ſome abſolutely neceſſary; ſome neceſſary for your own ſatisfaction, and ſome for the information of others; ſome for more rare and caſual, and ſome for your ordinary Auditories, and you will find their uſe in your obſervation of theſe, and may accordingly more or leſs engage your ſelf in them as you ſhall find your ſelf invited by your own *Genius*, or *Curioſity*; I ſhall therefore mainly meddle with ſuch as are introductory and general, and are of uſe for the moſt neceſſary ends; your own ſatisfaction, and that of your ordinary Auditory, And firſt, for that which is rational, and rigorouſly called *School-divinity*, moſt of the terms wherein its Queſtions are expreſſed being *Philoſophical*, the uſe of *Philoſophy*, eſpecially that of the *modern Peripeteticks*, which in latter Ages has ſo univerſally prevailed in the *Schools*, is ſo obvious as that I cannot ſuſpect you ignorant of it. But yet I believe you may be deſirous to be

be informed of the distinction of those parts which are necessary from those which are not; that so you may know at present where to fix your thoughts more closely in subserviency to your future Studies. For your satisfaction herein, I think (x) you may securely give over your reading it distinctly by way of *Course*, and apply your self more immediately to the Study of *School-Divinity*. For the *School-men* allowing themselves that liberty of largely discussing *Philosophical Questions* on the *Summes* and *Sentences*; as you shall by this means want none of them that are *necessary*, so you will be disengaged from many of them that are purely *heterogeneous*. But because they do frequently use this liberty licentiously, therefore it will be convenient to determine more distinctly what parts are necessary, and to what ends. First therefore, for that *natural Divinity* which is supposed true ancedently to *Divine Revelation*, and which is therefore only intelligible by *reason*; it being commonly reduced to two main principles: *the Divine nature and existence, and the Soul's immortality; and the nature of its faculties and the manner of its operations*, in accomodation to which all the Divine Precepts and Auxiliaries are designed; the for-

(x) This advice was addressed to a *Graduate*, who was therefore to have been presumed to have read over his Course already once. This is warned that others to whom it does not belong, may not imprudently apply it to themselves.

mer will be best advanced by *Physical* arguments drawn from the nature of the *celestial motions*, and the necessity of an universal ordinator of the *second causes* both to their own ends, in those that are inanimate, and at least to that of the Universe, in those that are not; *&c.* Which as they are evidently more *perswasive* and *sensible*, and of a more general accommodation to ordinary capacities, and such as we find principally made use of by St. *Paul* himself, not only in his *popular discourses* Rom. i. 20. but even in his *disputes* with the *Philosophers*, Act. xvii. 27, 28. and xiv. 17. so I do really conceive them more strong than those *Metaphysical* ones, that have been lately again urged and improved with the general applause of our late *Philosophers*, by the famous *Des Cartes*. And there is one Question, which as I confess exceedingly intricate, and yet omitted by most that I have seen of our late ingenious Authors that handled the argument, at least not considered with that accuracy it deserved; so I conceive it very necessary for the conviction not only of *Atheists* (which yet the unhappiness of our Age has rendred not altogether unseasonable) but also of some subdivided Christians, those especially of the *Roman Communion*,

munion, and that is the distinction of *true* from *counterfeit* miracles, which will require *natural Philosophy*. Wherein the notion of a true miracle, by the confession of all, requiring that it be above the power of *natural Agents*; for the determining of that it will be necessary to shew how far that does extend. And because it is yet farther agreed, that all sensible effects of created substances must depend on matter and motion; therefore this will require two things to be examined: *their utmost efficacy in general*; and then particularly *the utmost efficacy of those that are present at the production of the supposed effect that is to be tryed*; the knowledge of which I presume you are not ignorant to be the very design of natural Philosophy. Wherein notwithstanding you are not now to be confined to the *Peripetetick* Principles, but may more ingenuously examin others, and accept what you your self shall conceive most satisfactory. But the investigation of the particular Divine Attributes will be best performed by *Metaphysicks*, wherein all the terms requisite to this way of arguing are professedly handled: the *nature* of *Entity* and *Bonity* in general; the notion of those *Perfections*, which are called *simpliciter simplices*; and the exa-

mination of what are particularly ſuch by their *compatibility* with others greater than themſelves, and which are not reducible to any other Sciences, from whence it has even in (y) *Ariſtotle* himſelf the name of *Natural Divinity*. And from hence alſo depend all thoſe terms whereby even *ſuper-natural Revelations* are made reconcilable with *natural Reaſon*, and upon which moſt of thoſe objections depend that are indeed material, and neceſſary to be anſwered. For the whole force of theſe relyes on ſuch Principles as are univerſally concluſive in all ſorts of Entityes. For otherwiſe the confeſſed *Analogical* participation of the ſame perfections in *God* and the *Creatures* will be ſufficient to invalidate all Inferences drawn to him from particular experiments in other Creatures, which are the uttermoſt that all other Sciences are able to reach. And to theſe ends you will find the General Part of *Metaphyſicks* very neceſſary; and the Particular, where it goes no further than the perfect explication of their Nature, and confines it ſelf within its own moſt immaterial abſtraction. And therefore you may obſerve this Part moſt taken notice of by *Proteſtants*, and you will find it moſt generally ſerviceable to the whole deſign of *School-Divinity*. But then

(y) *Metaph.* L. vi. c. 1. Text. 2.

then for the other part that concerns *the nature of the Soul, and of its operations*; the supernatural assistances being proportioned to them, it will be necessary to know them for the understanding this proportion. And because some of these assistances are extended as well to the *nature* of their *Acts* as their *Morality*: and the moral manner of the operations is most answerable to the *nature* of the *Agent*, and accordingly best intelligible by its relation: Therefore it will be convenient to know them, first *Physically*, as they are handled in *Aristotle's* Books *de Anima*; and there especially the rational and intellectual degree, and others no otherwise than as they conduce to the better understanding their present organical dependent way of operation, and that discourse *de Anima separata* which you will find adjoyned at the end by some Authors. And then *Morally*, in *Ethicks*, from whence you are directly to deduce all those obligations that are *purely moral*; and the necessity and design of those that are *positive* and *supernatural*, and generally all those universal Rules, on which depends the prudential practice of *Casuistical Divinity*. For *Controversie Logick* I mention nothing, because I believe there is little in it necessary to your purpose but what is borrowed

from *Metaphysicks*, or some few things concerning *Faith* and *Opinion* and *Demonstration*, which you will find sufficiently to your purpose discussed on the *Summes* and *Sentences*. And as it will be thus serviceable in general to know the main design of those Sciences, and their influence in Divinity, for discerning the necessity of particular Questions, how far they are reducible to it; so in particular you may consider, First, whether it was first raised from any Theological occasion, accordingly to the Rules formerly prescribed; or whether it be capable of being used as a Principle for the deciding any Theological Controversie? And if it be, then secondly, whether that Theological Controversie it self be of any moment? and then Thirdly, whether that Philosophical Principle be capable of any certain resolution, and especially in that sense that is requisite for this decision? But for the improvement of principles of this kind in proving the *immortality of the Soul* (not now to reflect upon the piously-designed attempts of several ingenious persons in this regard) for my part, how convincing soever they may prove in the event, I can discern no great necessity of having recourse unto them or relying on them. For though indeed the existence of God

God cannot be proved by *Revelation*, it being so antecedent to it as that he that doubts of it cannot admit of *Revelation* to prove it by; yet is there not the same necessity here. For the Soul may really be immortal, though its immortality could not be made out from any natural appearances falling under our cognizance (daily experience furnishing us with instances of most certain truths which are yet uncapable of being proved from such appearances) in which case we may yet be assured of it by *Revelation*. For our doubting concerning the proof of the Souls immortality by *reason*, does not upon any rational pretence oblige us to question the *existence of Revelations*; and supposing that the real immortality of our Soul is attested and revealed by God, our own antecedent ignorance of it upon natural accounts cannot ground the least suspicion of the Divine Infallibility concerning it. Nay it is, from our prime notions of such a being, most certain that infinite truths are evident to him which are not obvious to our grosser observations, and it cannot be disproved that this is one. Supposing therefore that God has revealed the immortality of our Souls; and that he is in this, as well as in other Revelations, veracious; and that he certain-

ly does, though we do not, know the truth even in this particular affair; it must needs follow that we must be obliged to believe it upon account of such Divine Revelation, though antecedently we could never have known it by natural discoveries. This I have only observed by the way, to shew the *no necessity* of insisting on such proof, and to let Atheistical irreligious persons understand how little indeed Religion is concerned in their weakness. Yet I think, I might have added that *deserting* this way of proof, and insisting *only* on Revelation in this case is not only more *secure*, but in many regards more *convenient*, and more *agreeable* with the principles of Christianity, and better fitted for solving difficulties which are less intelligible on other Principles. But what I have to say to this purpose is both subject to be misunderstood and too tedious for my present design, and therefore I forbear.

VIII. VIII. BUT then for that part of Divinity that is Textuary the knowledge of the *Tongues* and *Phrases*, will be gotten by reading ancient Authors in their own words upon other occasions; and for them your own experience will hereafter be your more satisfactory directory. But for understanding the Text of the *Old Testament*, it

it will be alſo further requiſite throughly to underſtand the *Doctrinals* of thoſe *times*, and the *Traditions* of the *Jewiſh Church*. This you will find very neceſſary for the *New*, there being nothing pretended to be revealed in the *New*, but what was at leaſt myſtically prefigured in the *Old*; and there being many Doctrines at that time when the New Teſtament was firſt publiſhed, that were generally believed by the *Jewiſh Church* which yet were not ſo clearly expreſſed in the *Old*. Which as they ſeem to be connived at by our *Saviour*, ſo they ſeem generally to have been received without any New Revelations by the *Primitive Chriſtians*. And yet that way of preſuming preſent Doctrines to have been original Traditions is certainly as fallible in ſome inſtances as true in others, and therefore ought to be accurately diſtinguiſhed. The only way for underſtanding ſuch Texts as theſe will be to examine the credibility of doctrines that pretend to be originally *Jewiſh Traditions*. And for this you are not only to truſt the *Rabbins*, both for their notorious *fabulouſneſs*, and their little *Antiquity*, and their plain imitations of the *Græcian Philoſophers* even before our Saviour's time upon occaſion of their acquaintance with them by the

Mace-

Macedonian Conquests; whom yet together with *Philo* and *Josephus* I would recommend to you for the *Historical Relation* of those opinions and practices that afterwards prevailed, and are frequently alluded to in the *New Testament.* Which I conceive so far only creditable as we find their Notions so alluded to and confirmed by the attestation of those *Inspired Writers* who do so allude to them; or as they are ingredient in those *Schemes* whose other Particulars are expresly spoken to. For it is most probable that where *Propositions* are approved, that *approbation* is to be understood in accommodation to the sense of those who then maintained them. Which if they were; then all the *Principles* on which their assent to such Conclusions was grounded, and all the further *Inferences* which they were likely to deduce by virtue of their belief of such Principles, must also be supposed included in the same approbation. Especially where no *express* Caution is given against them, nor any *new Scheme* proposed. It is certain they who *then* lived would so understand it; and therefore the *Holy Ghost* must be presumed to mean it so if he suited himself to their capacities. But there are other means which will afford you more full

full and distinct discoveries of many things of which the now-mentioned Testimonies would leave you ignorant, I mean the Testimonies of the *Gracians* themselves. For it is the main design of the primitive *Christian Apologies* to shew that the *Gracians* preserved some Traditions entire from the division of *Babel*, or in after Ages derived them from the *Jews*, which Testimonies of the *Gracians* are yet both more numerous and more ancient than those that are now extant of the *Jews* themselves. By this means as you shall discover much of that truth which was mystically involved in the *Old-Testament*, though otherwise certainly intended, where otherwise there is no clear mention of the *Immortality of the Soul*, of the *Resurrection of the Body*, or the *future Judgment*, which are the very foundations, not only of *Christian*, but of all *rational*, *Religion*; so also the Original of many errors both among the later *Jews* and *Christians*. For this therefore I conceive it convenient to read the ancientest *Greek Poets* together with their *Greek Scholiasts*, and that you do not look on them barely as *Idle Romances*, but as *grave Philosophers* and *Historians*; for such they were reputed not only in their own times, but also by all their followers, as in-

involving *Divine*, and *Natural*, and *Historical* notions of their *Gods* and *Heroes* under *Mystical* and *Parabolical* expressions. Thus the name was used for *makers of Laws*, for *Establishers of Commonwealths*, for *Discipliners of Youth* and *Women*, as you may see proved from the Testimonies of *Homer* himself and others by the excellent *Heinsius* in his *Prolegom. ad Hesiod.* Hence they were after imitated by the *Oracles*, and accounted *Sacred*, and *Prophetical*, and inspired with a *Divine fury*, as were easie to prove if I had leisure. But yet because those things are related on the faith of much later Authors, and are mingled with their own inventions, and are expressed in dark, and designedly-obscure, resemblances; therefore two things will be requisite to be inquired into: First, whence they originally proceeded? whereby will appear both how far they are credible, and what was after superadded by the *Græcian* affectation of vain glory; And Secondly, what was their distinct sense? For the former, I confess the ancient *Græcian Barbarism*, their late incorporations into civil Societies, their then it self being divided into *little Republicks*, which could not chuse but continually allarm them with perpetual Factions and

and mutual jealousies of one another, and leave little time for incouragement for Studies, and their late invention of Letters, or of any means for communicating Tradition to posterity, make me unwilling to advise you to trust them for any thing ancient that is Historical. And therefore I believe your best way were to examin with what other ancient learned Nations they had commerce, from whom they might probably derive their *Philosophical* or *Theological Learning*; and particularly to enquire concerning such notable Persons as were acknowledged to have had some especial influence in their improvement? (Such were *Orpheus* for the *old*, and *Pherecydes Syrius* for the *later Theogonyes*) Whether they were *Indigenæ* or *Foreigners*? Whether they *travelled*, and to what Nations? And because the Ambition of the later *Greeks* has endeavoured to suppress those Testimonies that might seem to make them beholding to other Nations for what they gloried themselves to be the first inventors of; either by confounding Foreigners of the same name with their own, and by that means arrogating the glory of their actions to themselves; or by deriving their Original from their Gods, and those such as were Historically

ſtorically many, or uncertain, as they do with *Orpheus* when they make him the Son of *Apollo* and *Calliope*: It were well to collect out of creditable Authors what is mentioned concerning them, that ſo you may from other circumſtances conjecture whence they did moſt probably derive their Learning. And there are three Nations eſpecially, who, by reaſon of their undeniable Antiquity, and their eſtabliſhed Government, and their eſtimation of Learning, and their encouragement and opportunities, and publick deputation of ſome orders of Men for that end, might be very credible for the conveyance of the *Traditional Divinity*; and who, by reaſon of their familiarity with the *Jews*, might eaſily have corrected themſelves where they had been miſtaken: the *Caldæans*, the *Phœnicians* and the *Ægyptians*. Whereof the two later muſt needs have been known to them as anciently as their ancienteſt Inventions: the *Phœnicians* by occaſion of their notorious trafficking at Sea; and the *Ægyptians*, as appears both by the affinity of their *Tongues* and *Letters*, and from the *Græcian Apis*, whether the *Sicyonian* or *Argive*, ſuppoſed after his death to have been Canonized in *Ægypt*, and from the ſtories of *Ægyptus* and

and *Danaus* in *Ægypt*, of *Tithonus* and *Memnon* and *Phaethon* in *Æthiopia*, mentioned by the most ancient *Græcian Mithologists*, and from the testimonies of very many of themselves, if I had leasure to produce them; And especially in that most of their *Gods* and *rites* and *mysteries* were thence borrowed, as is clear, besides others, from that full confession of (z) *Diodorus Siculus* related also by (a) *Eusebius*. But that all of them were frequented by the latter Philosophers is abundantly proved by the *primitive Christian Apologists*. And therefore it will also concern you to be acquainted with the opinions of the *Philosophers*, those of them especially that are *traditional*, and who are known themselves to have travelled in these Countries. As for the latter subdivisions, they seem generally to have been built on the private wits of particular factious persons. Concerning whom, especially the *Stoicks*, what my thoughts are you may easily discern from my *Prolegomena* to my dear Tutor's Book *de Obstinatione*: "That if "their *Rational discourses* be considered "as conversant about such instances as are "uncapable of *solid demonstrations* from "purely natural Principles, such as the *Platonick* notions of the *Trinity* and the *Hie-*

(z) Bibliothec. L. i. p. 86. Ed. Græco-Lat.
(a) præp. Et. L. x. c. 8.

"*rarchyes*

"*rarchies of good or evil Dæmons*, and *the* "*state of the Soul after death*, and *the re-* "*wards and punishments of the other World*; "these will further admit of a twofold "consideration, either as to that *use* and *Au-* "*thority* that may be grounded on their "*Reasons*, or as to that *purely-Historical* "use which may be made of their Opini- "ons. If in the former regard, that can- "not be acknowledged very considerable, "both because the cases are supposed such "as are uncapable of any solid proof of "that kind; and the reasons they pro- "duce are therefore at the best only *con-* "*jectural*, and frequently *Captious*; and "they are unnecessary for us *Christians*, "who have securer arguments from *Divine* "*Revelation*; and for affairs of this na- "ture their *Antiquity* gives them no spe- "cial advantage over us; and they are "more clearly and closely managed by "later Authors. But if they be consi- "dered in the second regard, as to that "*purely Historical* use which may be made "of their Opinions, how weak soever "their *reasons* are, for explaining those "passages of *Scripture*, which are expres- "sed in their language, and allude to their "sense, whether as *approved* or *rejected*; "then a much greater value is to be put

"on

"on them than they could possibly deserve "on their own account. For thus howso-"ever *conjectural* the proof of such Propo-"sitions might have been supposed for-"merly, yet it might merit a confident "assent as grounded on the *surer word of* "*Prophesie*; nay though they be *rejected* "in the Scripture as *false*, yet so it self "they may help us to understand those "very Scriptures that were supposed to "condemn them. For the *terms* being "supposed *Philosophical*, the Philosophers "themselves must needs be presumed fit-"test to explain their own sense of them "(which is most likely to be the sense in-"tended by the Holy Ghost) and by un-"derstanding the terms we come to un-"derstand the Propositions resulting from "them, so condemned; which being ap-"prehended will help us further to dis-"cover what is necessary for bringing such "a discourse home to the purpose, which "must needs be very advantageous for "discovering the design of the Holy Ghost "in it, as that is also for judging of *con-*"*sequential modes of expression*, of which "kind are many *provisional definitions* of "the *Church*, and *doctrines* of the *School-*"*men*. But then supposing the *Rational Dis-*"*courses* of the *Philosophers* conversant

"about affairs within their own reach, "whereof they might be presumed com- "petent judges, they may again be two "ways considered: either as to their *in-* "*trinsick conclusiveness*, or as to the *actual* "*reputation* they had gained among the "*Jews*, and those other Nations among "whom they were dispersed, for whose "use the Scriptures were primarily design- "ed, and to whose defects they may there- "fore be presumed to have been origi- "ginally accommodated. In the *former* re- "gard their discourses will have so much "and no more credibility than what a "*particular examination* of their solidity "will afford to a Person *competent* to judge "of it; or than the fame of their *skill* and "*integrity* in affairs of this nature, might "have been conceived sufficient to per- "swade to such as were unskilful them- "selves, and so exposed to a necessity of "relying on their bare Authority. But "in the *latter*, their Authority may be much "greater as far it may be thought to have "been further confirmed and approved by "the *Holy Ghost* himself. For the *Holy* "*Ghost* undertaking in an *extraordinary* "*way* to supply the defect of *ordinary* "*means* in the discovery of such *truths* or "*falsehoods* as might prove *necessary* or *per-*

"*nicious*

"*nicious* in order to the ſalvation of man-
"kind; it is to be preſumed that wherein
"he did not offer a correction, there he
"preſumed the uſe of ordinary means ſuf-
"ficient. And then the only ordinary
"means of diſcovering their *preſent duty*
"and their *future intereſts* (eſpecially for
"the *vulgar* for whoſe uſe *Revelations* were
"principally calculated) being natural rea-
"ſon as managed by its ableſt *Profeſſors*,
"the *Philoſophers*, they having no other
"light antecedently to *Revelation*; it will
"further follow, that nothing taught una-
"nimouſly by ſuch *Philoſophers*, if uncor-
"rected by the Holy Ghoſt, was by the
"Holy Ghoſt himſelf thought dangerous
"to the ſalvation of Perſons obliged, in
"prudence, to rely on ſuch an Authority;
"nay that all things ſo unanimouſly agreed
"on, in matters neceſſary to be reſolved
"in order to ſalvation, if the Holy Ghoſt
"did not undertake a new reſolution, were
"ſuppoſed by him to have been already
"reſolved rightly by the Philoſophers
"themſelves, which no leſs than *Divine*
"*approbation* of ſuch diſcourſes muſt needs
"add more than a bare *Human Authority*
"to them. This is the ſum of what I have
more largely diſcourſed and proved in the
forementioned place, which you may per-

ceive principally to concern such Philosophers as are professedly *moral*. Who as they are also generally applauded by *Scholars* for the generosity of their Temper and Principles, and their agreeableness to *Christianity*; so they are not indeed guilty of that *unpracticableness* wherewith they are charged by some less considerative persons. It is true indeed that they thought the *Soul* alone to be the *essential Man*, and the *Body* the *Organ* and *Prison* of it, and indeed *praeternatural* to it; upon which account they made its *imprisonment* here a *consequence*, if not a *punishment*, of its *degeneracy*, and its *restitution* to its *primitive prosperity* to consist in its *compleat purgation* from all *corporeal faeculencies*. But this is not so to be understood as if they had thought the soul incorporated (upon what account soever) to be as free from being affected with corporeal impressions, as the *Musician* is from those of his *instrument*, or the *Prisoner* of the place of his *Captivity*; or had accordingly perswaded the Soul to her duty by a naked proposal of its reasonableness without any prudential praescriptions for making her capable of reason. For it is plain that they themselves conceived the Soul to be more than locally

united

united to the body by virtue of the *Nepheſh* as the *Jews*; or ψυχὴ (in oppoſition to νοῦς or λόγος or πνεῦμα) as the *Platoniſts* and *Primitive Chriſtians*, and it may be St. *Paul* himſelf; or the εἴδωλον as the *Chaldee Oracles*, or the *umbra*, as *Virgil* calls it; which being thought of a middle nature betwixt *material* and *ſpiritual* beings, and participating of the qualities of each, was thought to bind the Soul inſeparably to the body, and to ſubject it to a *Sympathy* in corporeal paſſions. Thence that *forgetfulneſs* of all its old notions, the πτερορρύησις or *flagging of her wings* wherewith ſhe could formerly freely mount at her pleaſure, the ὑλικὴ ἀλογία, the *unreaſonableneſs of matter*, the *drunkenneſs with the Cup of Lethe* repreſented by *Cebes*, which made their ſo frequent exhortations to be *ſober* and *vigilant*, imitated alſo by the Apoſtle himſelf ſo very neceſſary. And in complyance hereunto it was that they held that the Truth it ſelf was *undiſcoverable* and *unintelligible* by *impure perſons*, and accordingly they were as ſolicitous in concealing the *ſecrets* of their *Philoſophy* from the *prophane vulgar* as the *Pagan Prieſts* were in diſcovering their *Idols* to *uninitiated perſons*; and as the revealers of the *myſteries* of the Gods were puniſhed

with death, so *Hipparchus* the *Pythagorean* had a monument erected for him by those of his own profession, signifying his death in a moral sense for divulging their *Acroamaticks*. So that, though they held not the body to be any *part* of the *man*, yet they held so near a connexion with it as was conceived sufficient to render it uncapable of pure and naked reason (which would indeed have proved unpracticable to such persons) and were therefore as well *obliged* by their *principles*, as they did *observe it* in their *practice*, to accommodate their perswasions to the *opportunities* and *abilities* of the *persons* concerned, which being considered must needs make them practicable. All this might have been shewn and proved at large if it had now been seasonable. Nor is this practice proceeding on the *principles* of the *Philosophers*, repugnant to the *formal* and *fundamentally-virtuous* motives from whence only actions are denominated *supernaturally-good* in the sense of *Christianity*: such as *Humility*, and *a sense of our own weakness*, and *a perpetual actual dependence on the Divine favour*, and *a pure and primary intention of his glory*, and *no satisfactory reflections on our own condition here*; but *a resolute preparation to endure anxieties of mind*,

mind, and deprivations of the Divine comfortable presence, and *of the peace of our own Conscience*, and *solicitous apprehensions concerning our eternal welfare*, and *frequent occasions of disquietude* in the *rational Soul*, as well as in those *outward goods* of the *Body* or of *Fortune*. For it might have been easily shewn how that all these things as far as they are truly subservient to the designs of *Christianity* are admitted and applauded by the Philosophers themselves, and that which is indeed disapproved by them is not *approved* by our *Christian Revelations*. That *humility*, and *a sence of our own weakness*, and *a perpetual dependence on the Divine favour*, must needs have been owned by the *Philosophers*, appears from what I have said to evince their acknowledgment of the necessity of the *Divine assistance* in all *good performances*, in my *Proleg.* Sect. LV, LVI, LVII, LVIII, LIX. to which I shall add nothing more at present. And if doing good actions, for *the Glory of God*, be First, to do them out of a sense of our *duty* of *obedience* to his *Commands*, and a *subjection* to his *Providence* (however notified to us, whether by the *Light of Nature* and *Conscience*, or by *positive Revelations*, can make no difference, if the *light of Nature* and *Conscience*

be owned for the *Voice of God*) and Secondly, to *testifie* by them our *honourable sense* of the *wisdom* and *goodness* of *God* in his Providences even where they seem to carnal sensual judgments most *absurd* and *rigorous*; and Thirdly, not only to entertain and manifest this *honourable opinion* in our *selves*, but also to endeavour by such our Actions to propagate the like honourable opinions to *others*; and Fourthly, to renounce all vain glory of our *own*, whether as it signifies a *complacency in other Mens opinions*; or *an ascribing to our selves* those actions which had been indeed performed by the *Divine assistance*: If, I say these things be meant by *acting for the Glory of God*; then these *Philosophers*, how rarely soever they mention the *word*, most certainly have owned the *thing*, concerning which alone learned and candid persons would be solicitous. And it may be they who would make more necessary would find it more difficult to *prove* than to *assert*. So also for *our unsatisfiedness with our condition here*; if thereby be understood a *murmuring* and *repining* at the condition allotted us by *Providence*, however *ungrateful* it may seem to *flesh* and *blood*; that is so far from being *commendable* in the repute of *Christianity* as that

it

it is indeed a very great *Rebellion* and *Perverſneſs* againſt the *Divine dominion.* But if by our *unſatisfiedneſs here* that alone be meant (which only can be meant the former ſenſe being excluded) *an Opinion of the unſufficiency of ſublunary fruitions for the ſatisfaction of our more noble and capacious Souls*; the way of bringing Men to ſuch an Opinion ſeems to be the *principal*, if not the *adæquate*, deſign of this *Moral Philoſophy* I am now diſcourſing of. The greateſt *ſeeming Paradox* is how to explain how *Philoſophy* does diſpoſe perſons for enduring the *deprivation of thoſe good things of the mind which have an intrinſic moral goodneſs*, ſuch as *anxieties of mind, a ſenſeleſſneſs and dulneſs in the performance of duties*, and the other inſtances already mentioned. And the difficulty here ſeems the more conſiderable becauſe the two fundamental principles of theſe perſons in this affair, ſeem, if not utterly *falſe*, yet, very *unſecure*: Firſt, that *God never exerciſes good men with the loſs of any thing that is really good, and that ſuch are all, and only, the goods of the mind*, which is the only ſeat of happineſs. For by this means perſons are taught not to *expect* evils of this kind, which muſt needs both render them more *ſecure* and *unpro-*

vided

vided for their *reception*, and the *unexpectedness* of such *evils* would also *aggravate* their *vexatiousness*. And Secondly, that *it is in the power of good Men to avoid even all surprisals to any thing indecent that might deservedly procure by way of punishment any intervals of Divine displeasure*, wherein all their disappointment must tend to their further disquietment. Besides that by the *former principle*, God never inflicting *spiritual evils* on *arbitrary accounts*, but in case of *demerit*; and this *demerit*, by the *latter*, never agreeing to a *good Man* (seeing its very supposition does *ipso facto* make him cease to be such) *good Men* will not seem obliged to expect it, and therefore not to be provided for it. But notwithstanding all this, I conceive it certain First, that *understanding all these things concerning him whom the Philosophers call a wise Man, and we Christians a perfect Man* (though they, as well as we, did question the *actual existence* of such a Person, as I have already shewn in my aforesaid *Prolegom.* Sect. LXII.) yet I say *supposing such a person*, all that they say on this subject would be true concerning him; *he would never be obnoxious to disturbances of this kind*, as *never deserving* them, and therefore would *need no defensitives* against

against them. But then Secondly, for those other ordinary persons who do most frequently occur in ordinary practice, I do confess that to apply these Principles to them would indeed be subject to the mentioned inconveniencies; but I must withal profess that I think it never was their design to make such an application; and therefore they must needs have been far from diverting others from such *expectations*, or from *providing* against them. For these weaker persons therefore it is plain, First, that they did acknowledge such not to act *rationally*, and therefore unlikely to be moved by *rational arguments*; so that their discourses on this account could not have been unpracticable as if they had only *shewn* them their *duty*, but not *considered* their *abilities* for *practising* it. And Secondly, that in persons acting so *irrationally*, passions were not so *avoidable*, nor their *Irregularity* easily separable from *themselves*, nor their *demerit* from their *Irregularity*, nor consequently that those *dissatisfactions* and *punishments* necessarily-consequent to such *demerit* so *hardly separable* from such passions (such as are most of those mentioned) could be easily avoided. For *First* they acknowledged a προπάθεια resulting necessarily from the

the *mere mechanical* impressions of exterior objects, in the *inferior Soul*; and *Secondly*, a *Sympathetical* influence of the *inferior* on the *superior Soul*, upon account of the præoccupation of *sense* in *sensitive Judgments* and *Performances* during the *minority* of *reason*, which, according to their principles, might by virtue of the former impression, incline the judgment it self to a συνεπιδοξασμὸς or συγκατάθεσις to the first φαντασία or δόγμα, that is, to believe the *things* really correspondent to their *appearances*, to *be* such as they *seem*, which must needs infer a parity of resentment in the rational, which had before possessed the sensitive appetite. And thus much they do not deny concerning their *wiseman* himself, of the *second order*, such as was conceived *existent* in *this life*. But further *Thirdly*, in weaker inferior persons they thought this *sympathy* so *naturally*, *consequent* to those *exterior impressions* as that it could not be prevented by *particular ordinary reflections*, but by *long exercises*, and *solemnly premeditated resolutions*. So that to *sensualists* or *weakly-religious* persons they both allowed reasons to *expect* such *disturbances of mind*, and the same latitude of *providing* against them as could have been advised by any

any other *prudence* whatsoever. For though indeed they might say that God would not permit any *real evil* to befal *Religious persons*, yet they never undertook (nay they warned the contrary) that no *apparent evil* should do so too; or that *imperfectly vertuous persons* should always value things according to their *real worth*, and not be *seduced* sometimes to mistake their *appearances* for *realities*; or that doing so, they, as well as others, would not prove lyable to dissatisfactions of mind, was never intended to be affirmed by them. And it might have been shewn how most of the disturbances now mentioned are imputable to the mistakes of *weak understandings*, and either are no *realities* at all, or at least, not really *such as they are conceived to be*. Thus those *anxieties of mind*, and *dulness* and *distraction in the performance of spiritual duties*, which are usually represented as so discouraging to *piously designing* persons, are no more originally than a meer revolution of their *humours* and *complexions*, and mistakes adequately occasioned by the *indisposition* of the *recepient*, not by any *malignity* of the *things* themselves. For indeed what reason is there to conclude their condition bad because their complexion is clouded with

with *melancholy*, a thing as little in their power, and as obnoxious to vicissitudes, as the vainest of those exterior fruitions so solemnly renounced by all pious persons? And what else but complexion can be the reason why they are within a while (without any accession of new *guilt*) disquieted with *jealousies* and *scrupulosities* concerning that which not long before in a mature process of judging they had pronounced perfectly innocent; and recover periodically, when the cloud is over, without any further *rational conviction*? Yet this is that which malancholy persons miscall the *fruition* or *desertion* of the *Divine internal visitations*. For if it were a real consciousness of *demerit* that were the reason of such an alteration of Judgment concerning their own condition: either the demerits must be supposed *frailties* and *inadvertencies*, and those are known unsufficient to put us out of a state of grace; or they are *great* and *habitual*, and such cannot agree to persons supposed *Pious*, who only, according to the principles of these Philosophers themselves, are intitled to *solid joy* and *comfort*. And the same *untowardness of complexion* seems to be the principal, if not the only, cause of that *unquietness of Conscience* of which such persons

ſons do complain; for if the guilt were *rationally* grounded, they could not be the perſons we are ſuppoſing them. So alſo for *ſolicitouſneſs concerning perſeverance*; it is certain that by the promiſes of *Chriſtianity*, he that does improve his preſent grace ſhall not be left deſtitute in any future exigencies, but ſhall either have his abilities enlarged, or his temptations proportioned to his preſent abilities. Which he that believes (as he muſt who profeſſes to believe Chriſtianity) can have no *reaſon* for *ſolicitouſneſs*, and a *ſolicitouſneſs without reaſon* can be imputed to nothing but *complexion*. So that the moſt likely means of prevailing on ſuch perſons practicable in purſuance of their Principles, are, both to *perſwade* the perſons that their preſent actings are *unreaſonable* and *erroneous*, and to remove ſuch prejudices as may *immediately* be removed upon *conviction*, and to *comply* with ſuch as cannot till in proceſs of time they may be made more capable of *better impreſſions*, and in the mean time to preſcribe ſuch *Rules* and *Exerciſes* as may at once make their preſent condition *moſt tolerable*, and put them in a ſtate of *moſt probable proficiency* for the *future*. The only thing therefore that may be complained of in this *moral Philo-*

ſophy

sophy is, *that it wants those advantageous arguments for comforting persons which are afforded by Christianity.* Which will be no reason of *neglecting*, but *improving*, it by such auxiliary superadditions. And it may be that want of compliance which is complained of, may upon thorough consideration be found to be, not such as may so minister *comfort*, for the *present*, as that it may withal tend to the *conviction* of his error, but such as might *nourish* and *confirm* it, and *detain* the person perpetually in so *imperfect a condition*, an inconvenience to which Novices in a Religious Life are too frequently obnoxious. For certainly a state of Religion prudently managed would be obnoxious to *fewer* disturbances of the rational superior soul than now we find it, if indeed to *any* at all. And lastly it might have been said, according to the sense of the Mystical Divines, as well as the Stoics, that these visitations, which are so eagerly aimed at by beginners in devotion, are merely *indifferent* and no *real rational excellencies*, neither as making the persons enjoying them *better* nor *more honourable*, nor as arguing them *more acceptable to God*, both because of the difficulty of distinguishing *Divine consolations* from *Diabolical illusions*, and because they

dare

dare not ſay that *true conſolations* themſelves are diſtributed in proportion to their *perſonal excellencies*, but many times *greater* to the *weaker*, who need them more for their *encouragement*, and *leſſer* and *fewer* to *more excellent Perſons*. So that ſtill the Doctrine of theſe Philoſophers may hold, that good Men are not arbitrarily exerciſed with the loſs of any thing *truly excellent*. Nor are the remedies of theſe Philoſophers *only* ſo *ſtupefactive* as they are by ſome conceived, as if they were only addreſſed againſt the *pungency*, but did not *eradicate* the *malignity* of the *diſtemper*, the ſame way as a *natural bold complexion*, nay ſometimes *diſtemper of the brain*, does free from the *ſenſe* of *evil at preſent*, which notwithſtanding on *ſober thoughts* will prove as *afflictive* as ever in this life, beſides the more ſevere conſequential inconveniences. For it was their profeſt doctrine that *vertue* was the only *ſolid ſecurity* of *happineſs*, which muſt needs have obliged them not to accept of any other *indolency* but what muſt ariſe or be conformable thereunto, which no prudent conſiderate Perſon will deny to be not only a *ſolid cure* of *preſent maladies*, but alſo a *ſecure prevention* of *future miſcarriages*. And it is really

a mistake of the *true sense* and *design* of these *excellent persons* to think that they made their present satisfaction so adæquately the end of their *Philosophical performances*, as that they should make no *Conscience* of committing those *vices* which were less liable to *present molestations*, or of acquiring those *virtues* which were either *contrary* or not *contributive* to *present happiness*, and that *solid purity* was hardly intended by them, they being more solicitous for *sensual* than *spiritual purity*; for *purity* in *exterior appearance*, than in the *intention*, For it is plain that happiness was by them thought *necessarily consequent* to *virtue*, and *misery* to *vice* under their very formal notions. Which, whatever *sensualists* might think, could not leave them any ground of such a *distinction* of any *virtues* that were at *present afflictive*, or *vices* that might advance any *present real satisfaction*; nay which must have obliged them to a *prosecution* of *all virtue*, and a *detestation* of *all vice*, without any exception. And then the advantages they proposed to themselves being only grounded on the *intrinsick nature* of the *duties* themselves, and not being thought the least promoted by other Mens *Opinions*; must needs have made such

ſuch duties deſirable independently on *common fame*. Beſides that they did expreſly *decry*, and teach Men to *deſpiſe*, other Mens opinions, than which nothing can be thought more effectual for the eradication of all *vain glory* and *hypocriſie* and *conceitedneſs*, of which uncandid cenſures *ancient* as well as *modern* have been ſo forward to condemn them. I will not undertake to juſtifie their *perſons* in theſe particulars; but I think I may very juſtly except againſt this way of proceeding to cenſure their *principles* from their *practices*, both becauſe affairs of this nature concerning their *ſecret intentions* are impoſſible to be known by Men who cannot diſcern *their hearts*, and in ſuch caſes *common humanity* as well as *charity* obliges to believe the *beſt*; and becauſe there were ſome of them ſo *wary* as that they never appeared guilty of the leaſt *affectation* as far as *human obſervation* could diſcover them, nay gave evidences of the contrary (it had been eaſie to have produced inſtances if I had not been afraid of being too tediouſly digreſſive) and if the uttermoſt for which any ſhew of proof can be pretended were granted, that they had been *vain glorious* and been ſo *univerſally*; yet what is that to diſcredit the goodneſs

of their *principles* (for the defence of which alone I am concerned) the beſt profeſſions of the World being apt in their own caſe to think themſelves hardly and unkindly uſed, if their *principles* ſhould be condemned for their *unconformable practices?* And I have already ſhewn that ſuch *practices*, if they had *been*, muſt needs have been *unconformable*. Thus much may ſuffice at preſent for vindicating the *rational uſe* of theſe *antient Moraliſts*. For as for that *pedantick uſe* which ſome leſs prudent Perſons ſeem mainly to deſign in reading them, that they may upon occaſion produce them as Patrons of Sentences in themſelves ſo intrinſecally rational as that they need no *Patronage*, I think it needleſs to warn conſiderative perſons of its inſignificancy, of which the generality of *Scholars* are by this time ſufficiently convinced.

IX. IX. BUT then for the diſcovery of thoſe *myſtical ſenſes* which were deſignedly thus involved by the *Poets* and *Philoſophers*, and withal for unridling their *publick Idolatries*, the ground of theſe intricacies being that *Language of the Gods* mentioned by *Homer*, and inſtanced in many particulars by *Clemens Alexandrinus* Strom. IV. the *beſt* means, where there be any *regular* ones *poſſible*, will be to examin what theſe

were

were both among *themselves*, and other *Nations* from whom they received them. And these, according to the two ways whereby the *Gods* were thought to have revealed themselves to *Men*: either by visible representation of *things* whose natures had some *Analogy* with what they intended, or more *directly* and *familiarly* by way of *voice*; may seem also to have been twofold. For the former, you may, I believe, get much advantage from that otherwise reputed *late* and *unprofitable*, as well as *superstitious*, learning of the *Græcian Oneirocriticks*, which as they were evidently thought *Divine*, and the main instance of that sort of *Revelation* among all ancient Nations; so they had incomparably greater advantages for their conveyance to Posterity than any other kind of Learning. And the *Græcians* being confessedly none of its first Authors, but the *Asiatick Telmissij* (whether those of *Caria* or of the City *Telmissus* in *Lycia*) as (*a*) *Tatianus* and (*b*) *Clemens* relate, I suppose on *Greek* testimonies, it seems evident that they derived it *Easterly*. And for the *Lycian Telmissus*, it being, according to *Suidas*, founded by *Antenor*'s Posterity; it is impossible that they should be its first *Inventors*, seeing that from

(*a*) Orat. in Græc.
(*b*) Strom i. p. 224.

Homer it appears that it was practised by the *Græcians* themselves before that. And for the other, most of those *Asian* colonies being acknowledged to have proceeded *Easternly* (for most, if not all the *Græcian* colonies, that were there, were planted there after the destruction of *Troy*) may probably give much light for discovering the Secrets of the *Eastern Learning*, and of those Nations especially that were anciently famous for it, the *Chaldæans*, and the *Phænicians*, from whom in all probability they derived most of their *Traditions*. And another advantage of this, above all other, sorts of *mystical Learning* is, that, the explication of others was either reserved with the *Priests* themselves, or afterwards communicated to some few *initiated persons* after very severe and rigorous tryals of their secrecy, as you may see in *Lucas Holstenius*'s Notes upon *Porphyry de vitâ Pythagoræ*. And it is probable very few would undergo such tryals, which might therefore make them be more obnoxious to *corruption* or *forgetfulness*, which I suspect to be the true reason of those corruptions among the *Græcians* themselves, till they were again repaired by the *Philosophers* by a new intelligence with those Nations from whom they had originally derived

derived them. But the ordinary practice and profession of this made its explication also not at all subject to those inconveniencies. So also you will, I believe, get much assistance from the *Ægyptian Hieroglyphicks* (though that also be thought by many an unprofitable learning) for understanding the *ridiculous* (*) *Statues* of their *Gods*, and their *Sacrifices*, and *Vivaria* of *sacred animals*, and their *mystical ceremonies* which afterwards even they themselves that were initiated knew not, and many of the *Pythagoræan Symbols*, and the *mystical Philosophy*. For that this was a sacred manner of expressing themselves, besides many others, (c) *Origen* expressly affirms; and that *Circumcision* was necessary for initiating them that were desirous to learn it is very probable. Upon which account *Pythagoras* may be thought to have endured that rite, according to (d) *Clemens Alexandrinus*; for he could not legally have retired to his *Gentile* course of life, if he had been Circumcised by the *Jews*, it being only administred

(*) So *Cellus*: Ὀυ φαῦλα αἰνίσματα ἐπὶν ἰδεῶν αἰδίων, καὶ ἔχ (ὡς δοκεῖσιν οἱ πολλοὶ) ζώων ἑρμαείων πιμαῖς καὶ τοιαῦτα διδάσκωσιν. *ap.* Orig. *L.* III. *p.* 121.

(c) *in Rom.* c. II. & cont. *Cels.* L. I. *Porphyry* calls the *Ægyptians*, λοιμωτάτους πάντων, οἱ τοσοῦτον ἀπεῖχον τοῦ φονεύειν τὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων, ὥστε τὰς τύπων εἰκόνας μιμήματα τῶν θεῶν ἐποιοῦντο. de *Abst.* L. II. Sect. 26. *Though afterwards he express himself more doubtfully*, εἴτε ὄντως θεοὺς ἡγούμενοι, εἴτε ἐξεπίτηδες τὰ τῶν θεῶν εἴδη βοοπρόσωπα, καὶ ὀρνιθοπρόσωπα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιοῦντες ὅπως ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐξ ἴσου καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέχοιντο, εἴτε καὶ δι' ἄλλας αἰτίας μυστικωτέρας, L. III. Sect. 16.

(d) Strom I. p. 221.

ſtred by them to their *Proſelytes of Juſtice*, whoſe *recidivation* was counted as piacular as that of the *natural Jews* themſelves. And probably that opinion of many mentioned by (*e*) St. *Ambroſe*, making him a *natural Jew*, contrary to the general conſent of others who make him a *Tyrrhenian*, or of *Aſia*, might hence have had its original, whereas it is evident not only from the former teſtimony of *Origen*, but alſo from (*f*) *Ariſtophanes* and (*g*) *Herodotus*, which latter place is alſo quoted by (*h*) *Joſephus*, nay from the very inſtance of *Appian* himſelf, that notorious and bitter enemy to the *Jews*, who is yet reported by the ſame *Joſephus* to have dyed of it, that Circumciſion was afterwards derived to many other Nations, and particularly to the *Ægyptians* from whom *Celſus* thinks the *Jews* to have borrowed it *apud Orig.* L. i. Which, by the way, being appropriated in the Scriptures to the *Jews*, ſo as that the *uncircumciſed* and the *Gentiles* are uſed *ſynonymouſly*; yet being alſo before the Travels of the *Philoſophers*, borrowed by other Nations; will give a ſtrong ſuſpicion of their conveying their *doctrines* together with their *ceremony of initiation*. This obſervation may indeed confirm the vulgar opinion concerning the *Phænicians*,

(*e*) Ep. 6. ad *Iren.*

(*f*) *Acharnes.*

(*g*) *Euterpe* c. 36. 104.

(*h*) L. I. cont. *Appion.*

Phænicians, both becauſe it hence appears that they did not uſe *Circumciſion* anciently, nay ſeem to have abhorred it, which made themſelves abhorred by the *Jews*, and therefore their receiving it afterwards ſeems to argue them better affected to the *Jews*, from whom upon that account it ſeems probable that they received it. Beſides, their good affection to the *Jews* appears from the very friendly league of *David* and *Solomon* with *Hiram*, that I may not mention the marriage of *Ahab* with *Jezabel* the Daughter of *Ithobalus*, and that uncircumciſion is never, that I remember, objected to them in *Scripture* after the time of *Saul*. So that, together with that, it is not improbable that they might receive other things to which they were leſs averſe, eſpecially if any credit may be given to the pretended *Sanchoniathon*. But for the *Ægyptians* and *Æthiopians*, I do not think it ſo eaſily proved that they received their Circumciſion from the *Jews*. For Firſt, I know no ground of believing it an innovation among them, the Scripture it ſelf never upbraids them with *uncircumciſion*. And Secondly, the *Circumciſion* it ſelf was differently practiſed among them from the cuſtom of the *Jews*. It was not as with the *Jews* adminiſtred the

See the Diſcourſe at the end.

eighth

eight day, nor as with the *Arabians* in imitation of *Ismael* the *thirteenth year*, but to persons *fully adult* (such as was *Appion* when he died of it) nor to all persons of their nation or superstition, but only to some eminently qualified persons that were fit to be initiated in their *mysteries*; not only to *men*, nor indeed to any but such as I have already mentioned, but also to *women*, and that rather for a *natural cause* proper to the women of those Countries, as *Physicians* conceive, than any matter of *Religion*, whatever is pretended at present to the contrary (for I look on the fable of *Maqueda* their pretended Queen of *Sheba's* institution of it related by *Zaga Zabo* in *Damianus a Goes* as not worthy to be taken notice of) So that at least in regard of them this argument for their deriving other things from the *Jews* together with their *Circumcision* will not hold. Nor do I think the customs of the modern *Æthiopick Abyssens*, though they may indeed argue a *Judaizing* disposition in their first converters to *Christianity*, sufficient to argue any communication of theirs with the *Jews* in the time of their *Paganism*, which is the only thing I am at present discoursing of. For the other way of expressing the mind of their Gods

to

to them *articulately* by *voice* as ſome of them ſeem to have been ſeigned purpoſely for their obſcurity: ſo I believe you will find very many of them ſignificant in other Tongues. And for this purpoſe I conceive it convenient that you were acquainted with the *Theory* of the antient *Magick*. For, beſides that the *ancient Philoſophers* did by all means aim at the *neareſt* and *moſt familiar* converſation with their Gods; and that the name was not then, as it was after, counted *infamous*; and even after it was, they are ſtrongly ſuſpicious of their too good affections to it from the ſtrange ſtories of *Apollonius Tyaneus*, *Porphyry* and *Jamblichus*, and thoſe ἀνεμίαι they ſo much ſpeak of; many of the primitive Hereticks, who exactly inſiſted on their footſteps as their *Patriarchs*, as *Tertullian* calls them, did plainly practice it, as *Simon* and *Menander*, and *Marcus*, and *Baſilides*, and moſt of their names of their *Æones*, and ſome of their *ſacred rites* mentioned in *Irenæus*, are meerly *Magical*. And as the *true Religion* was by degrees perverted into *Idolatry*, ſo *Magick* in the bad ſenſe ſeems to have been nothing but a further degeneration of *ancient Idolatry*. Only the notion is clearer here then among the *Græcians*, that they being

ing applyed only to ſuch whom they thought *properly Gods*: the ſeveral vertues of him that is *ſupreme*, or the influence of the *Stars*, or the *preſident Dæmons*, (not to the *inanimated elements of nature*) or *canonized Heroes*; moſt of them are *exotical* (which is the reaſon of their ſtrangeneſs in the *Greek*) nay in *Oriental Tongues* which have an affinity with the *Hebrew*, and may therefore the more probably give light to the *Idolatry* of thoſe Nations that are alluded to in the *Old Teſtament*. Beſides theſe *Oriental* People were eſpecially inquiſitive in all Religions, for the names of their *moſt powerful Gods*, and ſo ſometimes of the *true* as well as *falſe*. Thus I am apt to ſuſpect thoſe imitations of the *Tetragrammaton* to have been derived to the *Occidentals*. Thus the name *Jovis* among the *Romans*, which from *Suidas* and *Ennius* and *Lucius Ampelius*, and moſt ancient Anthors, appear to have been the *Nominative caſe*, whence they derived their *Vejoves* and *Dejoves*; and, which brings it yet cloſer to my purpoſe as I remember, *Varro* in St. *Auguſtine*, makes him worſhiped by the *Jews*. So Ἰώ and Ἰαώ Ἰευώ and Ἰωβά, which you may ſee inſtanced and excellently diſcourſed of by Mr. *Nicholas Fuller* in Miſcel. Sacr. L. ii. c. 6. and

vid. *Selden.* de Diis ſyr. Synt. II. Cap. I.

and iv. c. 13, 14. (which Author I shall recommend to your reading on vacant occasions) and the God Ἰαῶ is by (*i*) *Diodorus Siculus* also said to have given the Law to *Moses*. And that these names were divulged by the *Magicians*, besides the word of *Origen* περὶ Ἀρχῶν (produced out of a Greek M. S. by the forementioned (*k*) Mr. *Fuller*, though now not extant, that I know of, nor by what appears after the diligent search of *Petrus* (*l*) *Daniel Huetius* the Author of the late collection of *Origen's* Greek Commentaries, nor any thing, as I remember, answering it in the *Latin* Translation of *Ruffinus*, who yet is not famed for rendring the *Greek* exactly, nor does himself pretend to it) confirming my conjecture; will be reasonable to believe: whether we consider that there is no plausible Author pretended for it, none of the *Philosophers*; or those wicked uses it was put to in the rites of *Bacchus* and *Apollo*; or that commendation given it by the *Devil* himself in the Oracle of *Apollo Clarius*, wherein he confesses, (*m*)

(*i*) Bibliothec. L. I. Part. 2.

(*k*) L. IV. c. 13.

(*l*) Origenian.

——Ἀπατόν θεὸν ἔμμεν Ἰάω,

(*m*) apud *Macrob.* Sat. L. I. c. 18.

sure for some such mischievous purpose. So also the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*

(n) cont. Cels. L. I. & L. iv. p. 183, 184. L. v. p. 262.
(o) ib. L. I.
(p) Act. xix. 13.

Jacob is mentioned by (n) *Origen* as invoked by *Magicians*, nay and the name of *Jesus* himself, not only in him, (o) but also by the Sons of *Sceva* in the *Acts*. (p) To which I might add that security of conveyance in them, their superstition forbidding them the liberty even of a Translation, which was a great reason of their strangeness among the Græcians, and yet is professedly maintained as reasonable by (q) *Jamblicus*, as great an enemy as he seems to *Magick*, and it seems to have been the Opinion of the *Stoicks* defended by *Origen*. L. I. p. 20. And for this you may see the necessity of the *Oriental Tongues*, which if you cannot spare time for your self, I would advise you to be acquainted with some that is excellent in them, whom you may consult upon occasion. But that which I believe would be most serviceable for this design among the *Greek Idolatries* is the *Coptite* or ancient *Ægyptiack*, from whom as I said formerly, they borrowed very many of them. Wherein though both the likeness of the Character, and the signification of many of their words, may be easily discernible; yet both in some, the Idomes of the Tongues will make the difference more apparent, and where they do not, it would

(q) *De Myster.*

would at least concern you to know their convenience, for the Historical enquiry, whether among the others there was any thing proportionable? And possibly you will find some assistance this way for the understanding those hard mystical words used by the *Romans*, mentioned by (r) *Arnobius*, Though seeing *Tages*, and the *Hetrurians* the reputed *Indigenæ*, were thought to be the Inventors of most of those sacred rites wherein they were used; I conceive the right knowledge best deducible from the anciet *Hetrurian* Tongue before it was corrupted by those numerous *Greek Colonies* that overspread afterwards a great part of *Italy*. And for this your best conjectures will be drawn from those absolete old *Latin* words, in *Ennius*, *Plautus*, *Festus*, *Varro*, &c. and other latter *Antiquaries* and *Grammarians*. And in this whole way of deriving unknown words to their primitive Originals, you must allow many variations, either for want of answerable letters or the ignorance of latter transcribers; wherein, that you may not be irregular, it would concern you to be critically acquainted in both Tongues, the *borrower* and the *borrowed*, that by comparison of both you may conjecture what alterations were likely to happen

(r) L. VII. *adv. Gent.*

happen. But besides this use of *Oneirocriticks* and *Hieroglyphicks* and the other *Pagan mystical* arts of concealment for understanding the hidden senses of their *Poets* and *Philosophers*, and their *Public Idolatries*; I have observed another use made of them by some very learned persons, for explaining the *Prophetick* Books of *Scripture*, which because it may seem something strange at the first sight, and is not cleared particularly by those *Ingenious Authors* that use it, and may withal be very apposite for the use of a *Scholastical Divine*; it may be seasonable on this occasion to give some account of it. *First*, therefore I suppose that God did intend that these *Prophesies* which were committed to *writing*, and enrolled in the *publick Cannon* of the *Church*, should be *understood* by the persons concerned in them. For otherwise it could not properly be called a *Revelation*, if after the discovery things still remained as intricate as formerly. And it is not credible that God should Publish Revelations only to *exercise* and *puzzle* the industry of humane enquiries; or as an evidence of his own knowledge of things exceeding ours (though indeed that it self cannot be known by us unless we be able to discern some sense which other-

otherwise could not have been known than by such Prophesies) much less to give occasion to *Enthusiasts* and *cunningly designing persons* to practise *seditions* and *innovations* under the pretence of *fulfilling Prophesies*, without any possibility of *rational confutation* by the *Orthodox*, who, upon this supposal must be presumed as ignorant of them as themselves; and there is no prudent way of avoiding this *uselessness* and *dangerousness* but by rendring them intelligible to the Persons concerned. And *Secondly*, the Persons concerned in these kinds of *Revelations*, cannot be the *Prophets themselves* or any other *private Persons* of the ages wherein they were delivered, but the *Church in general* also in *future ages*. For as *Prophesie* in general is a *gratia gratis data*, and therefore as all others of that kind given *primarily* and *originally* for the *publick use* of the *Church*; so certainly such of them as were committed to writing, and designedly propagated to *future ages*, must needs have been of a *general* and *permanent concernment*. And *Thirdly*, the Church concerned in those *Prophesies*, cannot only be those Ages which were to survive their accomplishment, but also those before; and therefore it cannot be sufficient to pretend,

as many do, that these Prophesies shall then be *understood* when they are *fulfilled*, but it will be further requisite to assert that they may be so before. For the only *momentous reason*, that must be conceived concerning these, as well as other, Revelations, must be some duty which could not otherwise have been known, which must have been something *antecedent*, for all *consequent* duties of *patience* and *resignation* are common to them with other *Providences*, and therefore may be known in an *ordinary way*. Now for *antecedent* duties, such as seem to be intimated in the *Prophesies themselves* where any are mentioned, nothing can suffice but an *antecedent information*. Besides to what end can this *post-nate* knowledge serve? For satisfying *Christians* of the *Divine prescience* upon the *accomplishment* of his *predictions*? This is *needless*; for they already profess themselves to believe it. Is it therefore for the *conviction* of *Infidels*. But neither can this be presumed on a *rational account*. For how can it be known that a *prediction* was fulfilled when it is not known what was *predicted*? or how can it be known what was predicted when the prediction is so expressed as to be capable of *many senses*, and no means are acknow-

knowledged possible for distinguishing the *aequivocation*? Nay will not such a *design* of *ambiguity* seem to such a Person suspicious of that *stratagem* of the *Delphick Oracles*, to preserve the reputation of a *Prophetick Spirit* by a provision beforehand for avoiding the danger of *discovery*? For indeed this kind of Prophesie will be so weak an argument for proving *Divine Inspiration*, as that indeed it may agree to any natural Man of *ordinary prudence*. For in *publick affairs* (the subject of these Prophesies) which proceed more *regularly* and are less obnoxious to an interposition of *private Liberty*, the *multitude* who are the causes of such Revolutions generally following the *complexion* of their bodies, and therefore being as easily determined, and therefore, predicted from *natural causes*, as such their *complexions*; it will not be *hard*, at least, very *probably*, to conjecture *future contingencies* from *present appearances* of their *natural causes*. And then by foretelling them in *ambiguous expressions* he may provide that if any of those senses, of which his words are capable, come to pass, that may be taken for the sense intended, so that a mistaking in all but one would not be likely to prejudice his credit. And at length if all should

fail, yet a *refuge* would be reserved for their *superstitious reverencers* of his *Authority*, that themselves had rather failed of understanding his *true sense* than that had failed of *truth*. Especially if among a multitude of attempts, but *one* hit in *one sense* (as it is hard even in a *Lottery* that any should always miss, much more in matters capable of *prudential conjectures*) that *one* instance of *success* would upon those accounts more *confirm* his credit than a *multitude* of *faileurs* would *disparage* it; because in point of *success* they would be confident of their understanding him rightly, but in *miscarriages* they would lay the *blame*, not on the *prediction*, but their own *misunderstandings*. Now seeing this way is so very easily pretended to by *Cheats* beyond any probable danger of discovery, it cannot to persons not already *favourably affected* (who only need *conviction*) prove any Argument of a *Divine inspiration*; and therefore will, even upon this account, be perfectly useless. Supposing therefore that it is necessary that these predictions be understood *before*, as well as *after*, that they are *fulfilled*; it will follow *Fourthly*, that where they were not *explained* by the *Prophets themselves*, there they were intelligible by the use of *ordi-*

nary

nary means, ſuch as might, by the Perſons to whom the Revelations were made, be *judged ordinary*. For that they ſhould be explained by *new Prophets* to be ſent on the particular occaſion there is no ground to believe; and if theſe Prophesies were ſo expreſſed as that they needed a *new Revelation* for *explaining* them, they muſt have been *uſeleſs*, and indeed could not have deſerved the name of *Revelations*, they ſtill tranſcending the uſe of *human means* as much as formerly. For if they had been revealed *formerly* what need had there been of a *new diſcovery?* and if this need be ſuppoſed it muſt plainly argue that the former *pretended Revelation* was not ſufficient for the information of mankind in the uſe of *ordinary means*, and that which is not ſo, cannot anſwer the *intrinſick ends* of a *Revelation*. This therefore being ſuppoſed, that *old Revelations* are thus intelligible without *new ones*, it muſt needs follow that their explication muſt be derived from the uſe of *ordinary means*. And then for determining further what theſe *ordinary means* are that might have been judged ſuch by thoſe to whom theſe Revelations were made. I conſider *Fifthly*, that this whole indulgence of God in granting the Spirit of Prophesie was plainly accommo-

dated to the *Heathen* practice of *Divination.* This might have been exemplified in several particulars. Thus First, the very practice of revealing *future contingencies*, especially of *ordinary consultations* concerning the affairs of *private* and *particular persons*, cannot be supposed grounded on *reason* (otherwise it would have been of *eternal use*, even now under the *Gospel*) but a condescension to the *customs* and *expectations* of the Persons to whom they were communicated. And Secondly, that an *order* and *succession* of *Prophets* was established, in *Analogy* to the *Heathen Diviners*, is by a very ingenious Person (*s*) proved from that famous Passage of *Deut.* XVIII. 15, 18. to which purpose he also produces the concurrent Testimony of *Origen Cont. Cels.* L. I. And Thirdly, that the sense of the *Platonists* and other *Heathens*, concerning *Divine Inspiration*, its nature and *parts* and *different degrees*, and *distinction from Enthusiasm*, does very much agree with the notions of the *Rabbins* concerning it, will appear to any that considers the Testimonies of both produced by Mr. *Smith* in his excellent Discourse on this subject. Hence it will follow Sixthly, that, as this Divination of which they were so eager, was originally *Heathenish*,

(*s*) Dr. *Stillingfleet*; Or. Sacr. L.II. c. iv. N. 1.

nish, so they were most inclinable to make use of those means of understanding it to which they had been inured from the same principles of *Heathenism*; especially where God had not otherwise either expressly provided for it, or expressly prohibited the means formerly used, and those means, others failing, were most likely by them to be judged ordinary. And that *Oneirocriticks* were the proper means among the *Heathens* for explaining their *Divinatio per somnium* answering the *Jewish* degree of *Prophesie by Dreams*; and indeed the principal art of the *Harioli* and *conjectures* concerning *Visions* as far as they held Analogy with those Representations which were made to other less prepared Persons in their sleep, will not need any proof. It might have been shewn how the principal Rules of the *Jewish Cabbala* were very agreeable to the like Arts of Tradition among the *Heathen*, and among them were a curious mystical kind of Learning contrived for maintaining a conversation with their Gods; wherein as they were initiated by the *Gnosticks*; so these Rules themselves were derived from the *Heathen Occult Philosophy*. And certainly it is most likely to have been some kind of expressing and explaining *Prophesies*, and some kinds

of *Learning* subservient thereunto, which was so solemnly studied by the *Jewish* candidates for *Prophesie* in their *Schools* and *Colledges*, and which made it so strange that Persons wanting that preparation, such as *Saul* and *Amos*, should be by God honoured with it. Besides that we find the punctual fulfilling of several predictions of the *Chaldæans* by vertue of their *Oneirocriticks* (those most eminent transactions of the Conquests of *Cyrus* and the Death of *Alexander* the Great were thus foretold) plainly implying that God himself as he designed those *Dreams* to be *Divinatory*, so he observed the *Oneirocritical Rules* in their signification. For it is not probable that Revolutions managed by such special designs and signal interpositions of *Divine Providence* could have been foreknown or signified by the *Devil*, he being frequently put to his solemn shifts of *æquivocation* for concealment of his ignorance in affairs of *greater moral probability*, and consequently of *easier prediction*. And it cannot seem more strange that God should observe the Rules of *Oneirocriticks* and *Hieroglyphicks* in his *Responses* when made use of with a pious design by his own people, than that he should answer the *Heathens themselves* in their own practice. Thus he observed the

sign

ſign propoſed by the *Philiſtines* for diſcerning the true reaſon of their ſufferings 1 Sam. vi. 2. 9. 12. and met *Balaam* in the uſe of his *enchantments* Numb. xxiii. 4. 16. and revealed our *Saviours Nativity* to the *Magi* by the means of a *Star*. And particularly for *Oneirocriticks*, their ſuitableneſs to this purpoſe will not be ſcrupled by them who admit the teſtimony of *Trogus Pompeius* (t) who aſcribes the firſt invention thereof to the *Patriarch Joſeph*, which will be very congruous to that prevailing opinion among the *Fathers* and many late *excellent Authors*, that all *Arts* were derived originally from the *Jews*. Beſides *Daniel* who was ſo famous for expounding *Dreams*, though he was thought by the *Heathens* to do ſome things by the *Inſpiration of the Holy Gods*, Dan. v. 11. yet had *Chaldæan education*, Chap. i. 4. and was a *great proficient* in it v. 17. and was accordingly included in the decree for *killing the Chaldæans* Dan. ii. 13. and was therefore after his *miraculous* interpretation of *Nebuchadnezars* dream, promoted to be *Maſter of the Magicians, Aſtrologers, Southſayers and Chaldæans.* Dan. v. 11. and therefore certainly was thought, in things not exceeding the power of the Art, to have proceeded according to its preſcriptions;

(t) *Somniorum primus intelligentiam condit.* Trog. ap. Juſtin. Hiſt. L. xxxvi.

tions; that is, in the *interpretation*, though not in the *discovery*, of the dream it self. And they as well as the *Jews* being concerned in the *event* of his prediction must also have been so in the *understanding* of them. So also *Moses* being expressly affirmed *skillful in all the learning of the Egyptians*, must therefore be presumed skilful not only in their *Hieroglyphicks*, for which they are so commonly famed, but also in *Oneirocriticks* to which they were also addicted as appears Gen. xli. 8. And methinks that challenge made in the *Revelation* (*u*) concerning the *name of the beast*, that *here is wisdom*, and that *he that hath understanding* should *exercise himself in counting the number thereof* (as it seems plainly to allude to the *Cabalistical* way of finding out *names* by *numbers*, whereof we have among the Heathens a *precedent* in (*x*) *Martianus Capella* who thus fits the *names* of *Mercury* and *Philology* to shew the congruity of their Marriage, besides very many more in the *Gnosticks* in St. *Irenæus*, so) seems to imply that it was, though hardly, in the exercise of this Art, discoverable even by human wisdom. Certainly St. *Irenæus* understood him so when he attempted to unriddle him by finding out names, whose numeral letters

(u) Rev. xiii. 18.

(x) L. ii.

ters, in the *Greek Tongue* wherein the challenge had been made, might amount to such a number. I do not, by all that has been said, intend that all *Prophesies* are explicable by any *Rules of Art* or *suitable conjectures*. I know many of the *Heathen Oracles* themselves were not. The Oracles expounded by *Themistocles*, *Curtius*, *Nebrus*, &c. did not depend on *Art* but *Luck*. My meaning is only concerning the *Prophetick visions*, and only those of them which are left *unexpounded by God himself*. For that these are to be presumed sufficiently intelligible in the use of *ordinary means*, may thence be conjectured, that whereas according to the *Jews*, this is made the *Characteristick distinction* betwixt *true Prophesie* and *Enthusiasm*; though both of them (the *gradus Mosaicus* of *Prophesie*, only being excepted, which is *extraordinary*) do imply a *mixed influence* of the *Intellectual* and *Imaginative faculties*, yet in *Enthusiasm* the *Imaginative* were predominant, but in *Prophesie* the *Intellectual*. Whence also they further inferr'd, that though *Enthusiasts* might have *Prophetick Instincts* as little understood by themselves as others, yet *true Prophets* perfectly *understood* their own condition and made *prudential reflections*, and

and were inquisitive after the *sense*, and were therefore importunate with God for a further Revelation of what they understood not; & therefore what they did not enquire after, and consequently was not, upon such their solicitations, reveal'd to them, was in all probability to be supposed already rightly understood by them *without Revelation*, and therefore in the use of *ordinary means*. Indeed it might so fall out that what was in the use of *ordinary means* intelligible might yet actually not be understood, & God might for that time be pleased that it should not be so, especially where no duty *antecedent* might be prejudiced by such a concealment; yet is not so late an understanding of such *Prophesies* grounded on *their obscurity*, but on that of the *event*, which when come to pass will be found, without any *new Revelation*, exactly correspondent. Besides all this for the discovery of *Tradition*, I think it would very much conduce to be conversant with the *Heathen Oracles*, especially the (*) *Chaldaan* & *Magical*. For from them you will most probably understand their sense, and from them the ancients, *Plato* and *Pythagoras*, seem to have borrowed their opinions,

(*) That these also are mystically to be understood we have the word of *Origen*. "Ἀλλ' εἶπον (says he) ὡς ἐν Αἰγυπτίων σοφῶν τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν, δυνατὸν ἰδεῖν καὶ ὡς Περσῶν παρ' οἷς εἰσὶ τελεῖται τὰ σεβευόμενα μὴ λογικῶς ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λογίων συμβολικῶς καὶ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς πολλῶν καὶ ὀπιπολαιοτέρων. cont. *Cels.* I. Item. L. iv. p. 189.

opinions, and *Porphyry* professedly did gather from them a body of Philosophy in his περὶ τῶν λογίων φιλοσοφίας mentioned by St. *Augustine* and others. And for your more clear and satisfactory proceeding in these enquiries, it would, it may be, be very available to know the common opinions that generally prevailed in the world upon the decaying of *Idolatry*, when the *Mysteries* began to be divulged, and the Philosophers themselves to speak more plainly; and by the former Prescriptions to examine how far they were intended by the Ancients; and from History, and the manner of their expressing it, from what Nation it is probable they derived them, and what means those Nations had either for preserving them from the beginning, or after for learning them from the *Jews*; and always presume that nearer the *Original* you shall find them more pure from after-induced super-additions. This method many may think something strange; and I do confess I dare not warrant it all upon my own experience, and therefore I have not at all been decretory, and have with all insinuated my reasons, and I believe no candid *Scholars* will censure them without a tryal; and if upon examination they be found unsatisfactory, I here profess my self very willing

willing to be corrected by those that are more experienced and judicious. Yet you shall find the main design of them to be the same with that of the learned Fathers for the first Centuries, only with some additional directions for their further improvement. But I proceed.

X. X. THE Third particular then concerned the necessary Books, and general directions for their management, in pursuance of these Studies. And here first concerning that part of Divinity which is *purely rational*, I do not conceive it necessary for you to trouble your self with variety of Authors, but with those only that are commended for their ingenious managing it, or who proceed on different Principles; and for the greater part of it you shall find it intermingled with *School-Divinity*, and therefore will not need any different Prescriptions. For *School-Divinity* therefore, according to the Principles already laid down, for the *Testimonial* part on which it is grounded (and the same you may also understand of the *Canon Law*: for *Burchardus*, *Ivo*, and *Gratian*, are guilty too of relying on inconsiderable, and counterfeit, and corrupted Authorities, for the which in *Gratian* you may read the *Emendations* of the excellent *Antonius*

An-

Augustinus) I advised you after the Text of *Lombard*, to read the *Fathers* and *Councils*, for the use I told you formerly; but principally for the *Historical* discovery of *New Testament*-Tradition, especially the earliest of them; those that are *counterfeit*, as well as what are *genuine*, if they be truly ancient. And your best order in reading them will be to begin with the *Apologeticks* against the *Heathens*. For these will advance your *Humanity-studies*, and will shew you their design in *Divinity*; and will be best intelligible by you as least depending on Ecclesiastical learning, and are most accurately penn'd as being designed against the *Græcian wisdom*, and the *Secular Philosophy*. And the names of those pieces of this kind, according to their succession as near as I can ghess (for it were convenient that you read them continually and in order, both for your own memory (for the latter usually transcribe the former) and for your better comparison of their *conveniencies* and *differences* together; and possibly you may not know them) are these:

I. St. *Justin Martyr*, his *Paræneticks*, *Apologies* I. and II. *De Monarchiâ*.
Confutation of Aristotle, if his.

II. *A-*

II. *Athenagoras*, his *Legatio pro Christianis*, *De Resurrectione mortuorum*, an excellent rational piece.

III. *Tatianus*, his *Oratio ad Græcos*.

IV. *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Ad Autolyc.* Lib. III.

V. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, his *Protreptick*, The greatest part of his *Stromatis* wherein his main design seems to be to prove the principal tenets of *Christianity* by the Testimonies of *Poets* and *Philosophers*, though mingled with many excursions against the *Gnosticks* who seem to be the greatest enemies of the *old Philosophy*. This Author I would have you read attentively, both because his stile is intricate, and he is full of quotations, which will otherwise be hardly remembred, and he is one of the most learned that managed that cause.

VI. *Tertullian*, his *Apologetick*, *Ad Nationes* Lib. II. *Ad Scapulam de Idololatriâ*, *De Spectaculis*.

VII. *Minucius Fœlix*, his *Octavius*.

VIII. *Origen*, his *Cont. Celsum*. Lib. VIII.

IX. St. *Cyprian* his *De vanitate Idolorum*, part of which is out of *Minucius Felix*, transcribed *verbatim*.

Ad Demetrianum.

Ad Senatorem conversum, either his or *Tertullian's*, in verse.

X. *Ar-*

X. *Arnobius*, his *Cont. Gent.* Lib. VII.

XI. *Lactantius*, his *Divin. Institut.* L. VII. besides that most of his other works tend that way.

XII. *Commodiani Instructiones.*

XIII. *Eusebius Cæsariensis* his excellent Collections.

De Præparatione Evangelicâ, *L. XV.* to be read with all diligence,

Contra Hieroclem. Possibly of a later *Eusebius.*

XIV. *Athanasius M.* his *Contr. Gent.*

XV. *Julius Firmicus Maternus* his *De Erroribus Profanarum Religionum.*

XVI. St. *Gregory Nazian. L.* his *Steliteutic. in Julian.*

XVII. St. *Ambrose*, *Cont. Symmach.*

XVIII. *Aur. Prudentius*, his *Contra Symmachum* and several passages in his *Peristephanōn* occur to his purpose.

XIX. St. *Chrysostom*, his *Oratio adv. Gent.*

XX. St. *Augustine* his *De Civitate Dei L. XXII.* an excellent work.

XXI. St. *Cyrill of Alexandria Cont. Julian L. X.*

XXII. *Theodoret. Therapeutic.* A fair Edition of the *Apologists* has been promised from *Leiden*, but they have not, that I know of, performed it in any more than

Minucius Felix and *Arnobius*, and *Lactantius* with notes.

These are all that I can at present remember, together with those two *Jews*, *Josephus cont. Appion.* and several pieces of *Philo*. The writers also of the secular History of the *Romans* from the time of our Saviour, which may contribute much to the understanding them are *Suetonius*, *Tacitus*, and the writers of *Historia Augusta* usually bound together, *Herodian*, *Xiphiline*, *Dio Cassius*, and afterwards *Ammianus Marcellinus*, and *Zosimus*, and those short, but extreamly considerable remarks of *Schottus's Victor*, reaching to *Julians* time, not omitting also the other *Victor* reaching to *Theodosius*, and *Eutropius*, and *Orosius*. For understanding their Ecclesiastical writings, and their full design, and how far what they say is to be taken for the sense of the Church, it will concern you to know the condition of the writers: both how they were qualified for knowing it, and how affected for following it? what violence they used in their stile, and therefore what regular abatements were to be allowed? And really, I think, you shall find no doctrines firmly relied on by them as the sense of the

Church

Church Catholick but such as were opposed by some of the then extant *Hæreticks*, as you may see in the account given of it, by *Origen* in his *Præface* to his περὶ Ἀρχῶν, and in *Pamphilus* his *Apology* for him, by (y) St. *Irenæus* (z) *Tertullian*, and *Alexander Alexandrinus* in his *Encyclical Epistle* against *Arius*, before its augmentation on occasion of that *Heresie*; by St. *Cyril of Hierusalem* also and St. *Epiphanius*, and *Ruffinus*. For this end therefore it will be requisite to read first those *Ecclesiastical Historians* that are ancient: *Eusebius* with the additions of *Ruffinus*, *Soerates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, *Evagrius* and the Collections of *Theodorus Lector*, and *Philostorgius* as you shall find them together collected in three *Greco-Latine* folio's, by *Valesius* with his excellent Notes and Discourses. With which it will be useful to compare their *Latin* Translations by *Cassiodorus* or rather by *Epiphanius Scholasticus* at his intreaty, not only for judging concerning the ancient *Greek* readings, but principally also for discovering the rise of *mistakes* and *forgeries* relating to those times in latter *Latin* Authors. But especially take notice of *Eusebius*, both because the rest do not meddle with what he handles but only begin where he leaves off; and because you shall find in him

(y) *Adv. Hær.* L. I. c. 2.

(z) *De Præscript.* c. 4. & *ad Praxeam* c. 1. & *de virginib. veland.* c. 1.

fragments of many ancient and excellent Fathers whose works are otherwise lost; and because the Ages described by him are the most considerable in this Affair. And then *Nicephorus Callistus*, who though himself otherwise late, and mingled with many counterfeits, and so of no considerable Authority alone, yet very likely had truer Copies of the Authors followed by him that are extant, and the assistance of some that are not. Then for understanding the *Arian* Controversies, which were the principal that employed the Fourth Century, you may read *Gelasius Cyzricenus*, and *Philostorgius* the *Arian* Epitomized by *Photius*, more largely than in his *Bibliotheca*, and published by *Gothofredus*, either of *Valesius*'s Editions as aforesaid, or with the large Discourses of *Gothofredus* and *Sulpitius Severus*. These are the principal *Historians* for the first four Centuries and upwards within the time of the first general Councils, into which I would have you principally to enquire, this being the uttermost Period that is owned by the dissenting Communions of *Christendom* as the most equal Arbitrator of their Controversies. But the fullest account of this as also of what Authors deliver concerning it, and a discussion of the

Histo

Historical Controversies, and most of what can be desired in this kind you will find in the learned Cardinal *Baronius*. But for his mistakes, either through oversight or prejudice (for he is extreamly addicted to the driving on the *Papal-cause*) besides what *Casaubon* and *Bishop Mountague*, and others of both Parties have performed, you may read that useful and elaborate piece of the *Protestant Magdeburgenses*, though written before him, and examine both their quotations, and determine impartially as you shall judge reasonable. Next, for understanding the *Heresies*, besides what you must be presumed to have met with in the *Historians*, they that handle them professedly are:

St. *Irenæus* in his *first Book*.

Tertullian, *Contra Valentinianos*, and in the *Appendix* to his *Præscriptions*, if it be his.

Epiphanius.

Philastrius.

St. *Augustine*.

The Author of *Prædestinatus* in *Sirmonds* Edition.

Theodoret.

Leontius Byzantinus in his *Schola*.

Theodorus Presbyter de Incarnatione, and others.

After this the works of the Fathers themselves that are genuine, and those that are not, according to their true Antiquity. Which that you may know and distinguish (besides those Ancients: St. *Hierom*, who transcribes most that he has from *Eusebius*, only translating him, and *Gennadius &c.*) I shall refer you to *Erasmus* and others in the *Editions* themselves, to *Possevine*'s *Apparatus*, *Bellarmine de Scriptor. Eccles. Cocus*, *Rivet's Critica Sacra* and *Gerhard* and *Labbe*, which it were well that you had by you to consult upon occasion as you are reading them. And what I have here advised you for the four First, after you have observed them, you will your self be able to improve farther in the latter Centuries. My design at present is only an *Introduction*. For the *Councils* (which I would advise you to read before their contemporary or latter, *Fathers*, both because their Authority is greater, and will be necessary to understand the allusions of particular Fathers to them in opposing the *Hereticks* condemned by them, and what Fathers are most to be relied on in what *Controversies*; for that is not to be determined by their greater *personal learning*, but rather by their approbation in the Church as her chiefest

chiefest Champions: Such were St. *Athanasius* against the *Arians*, St. *Cyril* against the *Nestorians*, St. *Augustine* against the *Pelagians*, &c.) you may make use of the same Prescriptions proportionably applyed, for knowing which are *counterfeit*, and which are *genuine*; which *Oecumenical*, and which only *Provincial*: which are very fundamental enquiries to what must be grounded on them. For which you will find an account, for the *Papists* in *Binius*'s *Tomes*, who usually borrows what he has from *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*; and for the *Protestants*, from the aforesaid *Centurists*, who though every Age bestow a Chapter on that purpose. The *greater Fathers* you will find by their names, but for those that are *less voluminous*, you must have recourse to the *Bibliothecæ*: both *Græco-Latine* and *Latine*, especially in the *last Editions*, though you may find some in the first that were afterwards expunged out of the latter by the *Popish-party*. For the *Schoolmen*, I should rather counsel you to read the prime Authors than the abetters of *Parties*, unless it be when you have satisfied your self of their sense, for the closer prosecution of their Arguments; for they are indeed very much improved by their *ingenious Com-*

mentators. For *Aquinas*, you need hardly read any thing but his *Sums*, which you will find to contain the Sum of his *works* (which mount to that voluminousness they have, very much by repetitions) as well as of *Divinity*, and that with this advantage, that these were his last and most præmeditate thoughts, seeing he dyed before he compleated them. These you may read with *Cajetane*. Then *Scotus on the Sentences* together with *Lychetus*; and for the *Nominalists Occam* and *Ariminensis*, if you can get them; if not, *Biel*, who is more easily procurable. If you would read any more of the ancient Schoolmen, let them be such as are not addicted to *Factions*, or those that are *moderate*; such are *Bonaventure*, *Durand*, *Gerson*, *Almain*, *Aliaco* and *Cameracensis*. For *Critical* learning you are to take notice of the *unusual* or *ambigious Phrases* of Authors, and mark them on the Margents of the Books themselves, if they be your own, and when you shall meet with any thing parallel, compare them together, and, if they be rarely observed, note them in Paper Books prepared for that purpose. For the *Antiquities* of the *Old-Testament*, and the *Jewish Customs* in the *New*, you may read the *Talmud* the *Chaldee Paraphrasis*, the *Old Rabbins*,

Rabbins with *Josephus* and *Philo*. For the *New Testament Sects*, the *Pharisees*, *Sadducees* and *Essenes*, besides what you will meet in the Authors already prescribed, and *Epiphanius*, who had himself been formerly a *Jew*, you may read the *Trihæreses* of *Scaliger*, *Serarius*, and *Drusius*; and others upon *Baronius*'s *Apparatus*. But the *Praxis* of all matters of this nature is sufficiently contained in those late Editions of the *Polyglotta* and *Criticks*, that I need not trouble my self to give you an *Inventory* of any more Authors, than what you will find quoted upon several occasions. The knowledge of old *Ægyptian Divinity* and *Tongue* you may have from *Herodotus*, *Plutarch de Isid. & Osiride*, and *Aristole*, the *Prodromus*, *Oedipus* and *Thesaurus* of *Athanasius Kircher*; the *Phænician* from *Sanchoniathon* in *Eusebius de Præp. Evang.* from those *Fragments* of *Pherecydes Syrius* in ancient Authors (for he is said to have borrowed them hence by *Suidas*, though possibly with alterations of his own) and the works of *Porphyry* who was their Country-man; The *Chaldæan* from their *Magick Oracles* bound up with a collection of all the rest of what nature soever, with the *Greek Scholia* of *Psellus* and *Pletho* by *Opsopæus*, and *Jamblichus*

blichus de myster. Ægyptior. & Chaldæor. For the *Lives* and *Histories* of the *ancient Poets* you may satisfie your self from *Gerardus Johannes Vossius de Poetis* and *Gregorius Giraldus* in his *Dialogues*, concerning the same subject. The *Lives* and *Opinions* of the *ancient Philosophers* you may read in *Diogenes Laertius*, *Plutarch de Placitis*, the *Greek Lexicographers*, and very many other ancient Authors, particularly in what is remaining of *Porphyry*'s work on that Subject, his *Vita Pythagoræ* and of *Plotinus*, and very much of that *Eastern*, both *Babylonian* and *Indian* Learning in the expeditions of *Apollonius Tyaneus* written by *Philostratus*, and his and *Eunapius*'s Lives of the more modern Sophists, *Damascius*'s Life of *Isidore* in *Photius*, and *Marinus*'s life of *Proclus*, and the fragments of all those mentioned in a learned Discourse of *Jonsius* a *Holsteiner*, and the late Mr. *Stanley*. Especially for their Opinions you may consult the excellent collection of *Stobæus* of fragments of many excellent Works now lost, but above all *Tully* who justly valued himself on account of his skill in the secrets of *Philosophy* as well as his beloved *Oratory*, whose *Philosophical* works personate the several Sects that were considerable in his time, and that with great candor and accu-

accuratenes as well as elegance. And though all the three Sects of *Philosophers* both *Ionick*, *Italick* and *Eleatick*, seem originally to have been derived from the *Barbarians* (as you may see learnedly discoursed by *Clemens* (z) *Alexandrinus*) and so would be beneficial to your design; yet I think there are hardly any professed works remaining of any of them but the *Pythagoreans* and the *Platonists*. For the former you may read the *Golden Verses* with *Hierocles*, and his *Symbols* with *Giraldus* on them, usually both bound together, with *Hierocles*'s Works, together with the late *Collection* of *Pythagorean Authors* and *Fragments* at *Cambridge*, MDCLXX. and *Jamblichus*. For the latter you may have *Plato*'s Works and Doctrine cleared by *Mersilius Ficinus*, and others that have endeavoured to reconcile him to *Aristotle*. The *Mystical senses* of the *Poets* (besides what you shall meet with commonly in the Ancients) you have explained by *Natalis Comes*, *Vossius de Idololatriâ*, and *Giraldus de Dijs Gentium*, and among the Ancients, by *Cornutus* commonly called *Phurnutus* and *Palæphatus* professedly. Their *Oracles* I have already mentioned. For their *Oneirocriticks*, there are *Artemidorus* and *Achmedes* alone

(z) Strom. I.

alone, and *Astrampsychus* at the end of the forementioned *Edition* of the *Oracles*. For their *Historians* and *Geographers*, I refer you to *Bodinus* his *Methodus Historia*, at the end whereof he has a *Catalogue* of them, and an account of the times which they lived in, but above all to their late *Princes*: *Scaliger* and *Petavius* for the one, and *Ortelius* and *Bochartus* for the other. And this may serve for your initiation in these Studies, which is, at present my uttermost design.

XI. XI. BUT the way for avoiding *confusion* and *distraction* in such a *variety* of them, which will belong to the Fourth particular of my propounded Method, will be to shew which of them are not necessary to be Studied at the same time, but in order; and for them which are so, what times distinctly are *most seasonable* For the former, you may, from what has been said, perceive what Studies are requisite for others, and therefore necessary to be first prosecuted; and besides what are more necessary for your present uses, and what may as yet be more conveniently omitted. Only it were well you would endeavour to overcome the *rudiments* of whatever you design as soon as you can, though they be not of *present use*, for you will

will find them more *tiresome* when you are *Older*. Of these therefore it will be unnecessary to speak any more. That therefore, in those that are at present to be followed, you may avoid *distraction*, and yet loose as little time as is possible: you may distinguish them into such as are more *easily apprehended*, and entertained with more *present* and *sensible pleasure*, and so leave a *more tenacious impression* on the *memory*; and these you may apply your self to immediately after your *recreations*, and after a little reflection, you may proceed to those that are more serious, and require a greater recollection. Among the recreative Studies I reckon *History* and *Geography*; for which I would have you begin with the *Ancients* in their *own tongues*, with the *Annotations* of *noted Criticks*, who both may put you in mind, and satisfie you in difficulties which you had not otherwise expected, and refer you to Parallel places in other Authors, where you may find that which probably you may sometimes be desirous of, some things discussed more largely which in your present Author are more briefly intimated, which it will be very beneficial to read immediately whilst the other things are more fresh in your memory. And when you are so far skilled in

them

them, you ſhould have your *Paper Book* by you, to note, and compare, and exercise your own conjectures concerning what is *ſingular*, and worthy of eſpecial *obſervation*; and then indeed you will benefit by what you read when you read with deſign and obſervation. But there are other Studies which will yet more particularly *exerciſe* your *judgment*, and require a mind more *compoſed* and *ſerious*, and therefore afford leſs pleaſure in reading, and upon that account will require more meditation: for ſuch I intend *School-Divinity*, for which I think it were well you allotted your *Morning-Studies* wholly, allowing only ſome time *before Dinner* for *Meditation*; wherein alſo I would have you not only exerciſe your *memory* in reflecting on what was produced by your Author, but alſo your *judgment*, in examining what means may be uſed for the determination of the whole *Controverſie*. And the ſame way you may take at *Night* which is another convenient time, in preparing materials for your *morning Theſis* according to the Præſcriptions already mentioned. The reſt of the *Afternoon* you may deſign for the *Apologies*, and your other *human Studies*. And I think it very commendable if you would employ the

Praxis

Praxis of your *Grammatical Studies* for the understanding of the *Scriptures*, and therefore that you would with them, together with your *Devotions*, begin and conclude your *Morning* and *Evening Studies*; but so as that you may afterwards draw from them some moral and practical observations that may be of use for the ordering or examination of your behaviour for the whole day. And the same advantage you may get by reading the *Lessons* at *Publick Prayers* in your *Greek* or *Hebrew Bible*, and noting in the *Margent* with *Black-lead* the *unusual Idioms*, or *obscure passages* you may meet with, that so, if afterwards you remember, or find, any thing that may contribute to their explication in your other Studies, you may know whither to refer them. It would certainly be very becoming and very beneficial too for a professed Divine to make the Bible his Common place Book for all his other Studies. It would be at once an assistance to his *Memory*, because the necessary Practice of his Profession must imprint this more upon him than any thing else; and it would exercise his *judgment* more than any other Arts of Common-placing, because it would fix him on a design, and by that means imprint things on his memory by their usefulness

neſs, which is the moſt beneficial and im proving ſort of *Memory*. And thus, I thin I have gone through all the particulars your preſent propoſal: both *how to ord your Studies to Divinity*, *what were moſt co ducing to that end*, and *what firſt to be tak in hand*, as *briefly* as was poſſible, conven ently, though, I confeſs, very much mo *largely* than I had originally intended. An I muſt ingenuouſly acknowledge that, as have already profeſſed my ſelf willing; ſo am my ſelf ſuſpicious that it will be neceſſ ry, that I be corrected in ſome inſtance wherein I cannot pretend to any conſider ble experience. I believe you may your ſe eaſily gueſs what they are, for I cannot no ſtay to enumerate them particularly; an as I ſhould be willing my ſelf, ſo I ſhall a viſe you to conſult Men whom you know t be skilled in each of them ſeverally (if yo have any conveniency) before you practi them. But if in any of the reſt, wherein I am able, or in any of your particular Studie you ſhall meet with any important diſſ culties, I hope you will uſe the Ingenuit of a Scholar in freely communicating the to

Your very affectionate
Friend and Servant,

H. D

A

DISCOURSE

Concerning

SANCHONIATHON's

Phoenician Hiſtory.

By *HENRY DODWELL*, M. A. and ſometimes Fellow of *Trinity-Colledge* near *Dublin* in *Ireland*.

LONDON, Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, and are to be Sold by *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Biſhop's-Head* in St. *Paul's-Churchyard*, MDCXCI.

THE CONTENTS.

THE Occasion *of this Discourse*, §. I. *The* Usefulness, §. II. *The* Credit *of* Sanchoniathon's *Work depends either on* Porphyry, *or* Philo Byblius, §. III. *The* Philosophers *allowed a Liberty of* Beneficial Falsehoods; *and they who first produced this Author were, in* Interest *concerned for him*, §. IV. Theodoret *and* Cyril *of* Alexandria *quote him only at the second hand from* Eusebius. *Several gross mistakes of* Cyril, §. V, VI. Sanchoniathon *very little known* before *he was produced by* Porphyry, §. VII, VIII. *No reason why he might not have been known, even* before *the time of* Philo Byblius, *if he had been really genuine*, §. IX. *He might have been taken notice of, not only as a* Historian, *but as a* Philosopher, §. X. *Concerning his* Means *of* Information. *The* Writings *of* Taautus. *The Antient way of preserving* Antiquities *by* Inscriptions *on* Sacred Pillars, *sometimes* abused, *and very* fit *for the designs of* Deceivers, §. XI. *This was generally pretended to by those who Rivalled each other for* Antiquity. *The* Pro-

phecy *of* Cham *and the* Pillars *of* Seth *contained the same Doctrines with those of* Mercury, §. XII, XIII. Taautus *the same with* Mercury. *The* Ammonian Philosophy *the same with the* Ægyptian, §. XIV. *It is improbable that* Sanchoniathon *could derive his Information from the* Books *of* Mercury, §. XV. Mercury *no* Phœnician, §. XVI. *The Pretences of* Philo Byblius *for defence of his Author*, §. XVII. *It is not probable that the* Antient Ægyptians *would have suffered* Mercury *to have* Revealed *their* Mysteries, §. XVIII. *It is not probable that the* Ægyptian Mercury *either* would *or* could *have* Revealed *them*, §. XIX. *The Son of* Thabion *perhaps the* Second Mercury *called* Agathodæmon. *He is supposed to be the Author of the Modern* Greek Writings *Fathered on* Mercury (*which if meant by* Sanchoniathon *must be a certain Conviction of his False-hood*) *perhaps first published by* Numenius, §. XX. *By* Hierom-baal *Priest of the God* Jevo *he meant* Gideon. Sanchoniathon *could not mistake him for a* Priest. Bochart *mistaken*, §. XXI. *It is not Credible that* Gideon *ever left any* Memoirs *behind him*, §. XXII. Sanchoniathons *account of* Jewish *Affairs could not have been taken from them*, §. XXIII.

§. XXIII. Intrinsick *Arguments of just Suspicion against this Author. His arrogating to his* own Country *the Glory of all Famous* Persons *and* Inventions, §. XXIV. *Several Instances hereof*, §. XXV. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. *An Account of the design of* Philo Byblius *in this Imposture. He was disaffected to the* Jews, *and perhaps set on this design by occasion of* Josephus's *Books against* Appion, §. XXIX. Josephus *there insisted more particularly on the Testimonies of* Phœnicians. *Other things that recommended the* Jewish Scriptures *to the esteem of the* Learned Heathens *of that Age. Several Eminent* Jewish *Writers who, by* Mystical *Expositions, brought their own Doctrines near the received* System *of the* Dogmatical Philosophers, §. XXX. Heathen Oracles, *in favour of the* Jews *owned for genuine by the* Heathens *themselves. The good Characters of* Abraham *and* Moses *in the received* Orphaicks. Joseph *and* Moses *taken for* Ægyptian Priests, §. XXXI. *A Set of* Philosophers, *several of them* Antienter *than* Philo Byblius, *who received the Authority of* Moses *as a Wise* Legislator *and a* Prophet, *and mentioned him with respect.* Chalcidius *a* Heathen, §. XXXII. *The* Jewish Κοσμογονία *taken*

into the counterfeited Works of Hermes, *about the time of* Philo Byblius, §. XXXIII. *How this might come to pass*, §. XXXIV. Philo Byblius's *Partiality appears in his making* Sanchoniathon *prefer his own City* Byblos *before all the Cities of* Phœnicia *for Antiquity, even before* Berytus *it self. Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *enquire into the* Archives *of the* particular Cities, §. XXXV. *He had, in this Work, a particular design upon the* Jews. *Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *live in the time of* Abibalus, §. XXXVI. *The time of* Sanchoniathon *fixed, not by the Age of* Semiramis, *but of* Abibalus. *His time, by the* Tyrian Records, *either* Equal, *or a little* before *the War of* Troy, §. XXXVII. *Why he was to Father his* Informations, *concerning* Jewish *Matters, on a* Jew *and a* Priest, §. XXXVIII. *Why on a Priest of the* God Jevo, *and on* Gedeon *particularly. How he might from his* Name *collect his being a* Priest. Hierombaal, ירעני *and* גרעין, §. XXXIX. *Why he was to begin with a* Κοσμογονία. *All Books concerning* Ægyptian Notions *Fathered on* Hermes. *The Fashion of Fathering all* latter *Inventions of a* Sect *on the* First Author *of it, especially in their* Dialogues, §. XL. *The* Ægyptian Philosophy *followed by* Sanchoniathon

niathon. *How he secured himself from suspicion of mistake in* Interpreting Mercury. *How the* Greeks *came to be mistaken*, §. XLI. *How the* Ægyptians. φυτσμὸς. Ἀπόκρυφα γράμματα, §. XLII. *How* Philo Byblius *secures his* Sanchoniathon *from the Suspicion of* Fabling, *and* what Fables *he means*, §. XLIII, XLIV. *Yet he forgot himself and Fathered a* Scandalous Fable *upon him*, §. XLV. *The Name of* Sanchoniathon *perhaps borrowed from the Famous* Ægyptian Sonchis. *The* Atlantick Theology *probably the same with that of* Mercury, §. XLVI. *Recapitulation*, §. XLVII. *The* Scripture *needs no Confirmation from* Heathen *Authors*, §. XLVIII.

A DISCOURSE, Concerning SANCHONIATHON's Phœnician History.

In Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. ch. 10.

§. I. HAVING in the latter of these Letters intimated some suspicion concerning the genuineness of *Sanchoniathon*, and considering how generally Learned men receive and quote him for an Author of that Antiquity he pretends to; as it will become me to purge my self from the suspicion of *Heterodoxy*, so I believe it will not be ingrateful to the ingenious inquisite Reader to understand what may be said concerning him. Which I shall do from some Letters which passed between me and a Learned Friend concerning him before the Publication of these *Letters* of *Advice*, and which, were in truth, the Reasons of my passing that censure upon him. N. IX.

Dr. *Thomas Smith* Fellow of *Magdalen* College in *Oxford*.

§. II. THE *Credit* of this Author does the rather deserve an accurate and impartial Examination, because of the great use which is made of him in clearing several

ral *Historical* and *Philosophical* passages of the *Old Testament*; and because he is generally taken for the *Faithfullest*, and *Antientest*, and consequently the most *useful Heathen Author* that was extant within the Memory of Learned Ages. Which might make all who either have formerly, or do still believe him so, think nothing too difficult to be confirmed by his Credit.

(*) His very *Name* was observed to signifie φιλαλήθης, which if it were given him by his *Contemporaries*, must needs have been a great attestation of his *Integrity* from them who had best reason to know him.* As for his *Age*, he is pretended equal to *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have Dedicated this his *Phœnician History*, that *Abibalus*, I mean who, by the *Phœnician*

(*) So *Theodoret. Therap.* II. Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ χρ῞ τῶν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον φιλαλήθης, &c. And so his *Translator*. But I had rather correct him from *Eusebius* whom he Transcribes; who, in two places where he has occasion to cite this same passage, agrees with *himself*, and yet differs from *Theodoret*. So therefore he: Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ χρ῞ τῶν Φοινίκων φιλαλήθως, &c. Συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγεγράφας, Reading φιλαλήθως for φιλαλήθης; and opposing *Sanchoniathon*'s writing in the *Phœnician* to the *Greek* Translation of him by *Philo Byblius*, and referring φιλαλήθως to what follows συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγεγράφας not to *Sanchoniathon* mentioned before. *Pr. Ev. l.* 10. *X.* 91. And then there will appear no footsteps of any *Etymology* of his Name. Yet *Bochart* gives a likely *Etimology* for that purpose, which, if it hold, will shew, at least, a design of *Philo Byblius* in giving him that particular Name. * *Euseb. Pr. Ev. l.* 10. 31. A. X. 9. 485. *Theodoret Therap.* II.

Records,

Records, is ſuppoſed to be the Father of *Hieromenus* or *Eiromus*, conceived to be the ſame with *Hiram*, contemporary with *David* and *Solomon* as appears, not only from the *Scriptures*, but alſo from the ſame *Phœnician* Records, on whoſe credit, no doubt, it is that *Joſephus* makes the Eleventh year compleat, or Twelfth begun of *Hiram*, to concur with the Fourth of *Solomon*, wherein the Temple was built. For he had the ſum of thoſe Records Collected to his hand by *Menander Epheſius* and *Dius* and *Hieronymus Tyrius*, and others, without whoſe aſſiſtance he could not have been ſo particular in fixing the certain year of *Hiram*. The Learned *Bochart* would have this *Abibalus* King of *Berytus* diſtinct from him who was King of *Tyre*, and *Antienter*. But if the account hold which we ſhall afterwards give from the *Phœnician* Records, to ſhew him to have been *Equal* or a *little Ancienter* than the War of *Troy*, (exactly as this *Abibalus* the Father of *Hiram* is placed by them who mention him) it will then appear that no other was meant than the Father of *Hiram*. That he is called King of the *Bertyans*, was for no other end but to ſignifie that he was *Sanchoniathon's*

XI° *Hirami*, Ant. vii°. 2. p. 259. Ed. *Gene*. xii°. c. *App*. l. 1. p. 1043.

Vid. *Joſeph*. Ant. viii. 2. Cont. *Appion*. L. 1. *Theoph. Antioch*. L. iii. ad *Autolyc*.

choniathon's Prince who was of *Berytus*, exactly as *Sanchoniathon* himself is in *Athenæus* and *Suidas* made a *Tyrian*, because his *Berytus* was, in his time, under the Jurisdiction of *Tyre*, which is again another probability that his *Abibalus* was the same with the K. of *Tyre*. *Porphyry* himself who first produced this *Sanchoniathon* against the *Christians*, makes him equal to *Semiramis*, who as he tells us in *Eusebius*'s *Preparation*, was either before or equal to the Wars of *Troy*; but he is confuted by *Eusebius* who makes her Eight hundred and fifty years earlier then that same War. Her Husband *Ninus* is generally, by *Heathen* Authors, made the utmost Period of all Histories they were acquainted with, who yet mention many things Antienter than that War of *Troy*. But this matter is excellently accounted for by the Learned and Judicious Sir *John Marsham*, who shews that *Porphyry* herein followed the more likely account of *Herodotus*, though *Ctesias*'s larger account had the luck to be more received. *Dioces* (the First King of the *Medes* after their revolt from the *Assyrians* according to *Herodotus*,) began his Reign *Olymp.* 17. 4. according to *Eusebius*. The *whole time* of the *Assyrians* was Five hundred and Twenty years ac-

Pr. Eu. l. 9. p. 31. B.

Chron. L. 11. init.

Tertul. de Pal. c. 2. ubi *Salmas.* & à *Cerda.*

Eus. Pr. Ev. x. 9. p. 485. 486.

Macrob. in somn. cip 11. 19.

Oros. L. 1. Chron.

Can. Ægypt. Sec. xvii. p. 522. Edit. *Lip.*

Eus. Chron.

Herodot. L. 1 c.

cording to *Herodotus*. If therefore we reckon backward from that Fourth year of the Seventeenth *Olympiad*, the time of *Semiramis* who succeeded her Husband *Ninus*, will fall out much about the time where *Porphyry* places it. Nor was *Porphyry* alone, though he had indeed few Companions, in following *Herodotus*. He shews that *Appian* did so too, and the most Judicious *Dionysius Halicarnasseus*, and *Josephus*. And, which is more particularly observable to our present purpose, *Philo Byblius* also agrees with him in placing *Semiramis* later then usually, whom he makes Two thousand years *later* than the Building of *Babylon*. Besides the *Authenticalness* of the Records, from whence he derived his Information, is extremely considerable (if it should prove really what it is pretended) the Sacred Writings of *Taautus*, that is *Mercury*, (of whom there is so much mention in those yet earlier *Times*, of which he wrote his History) the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνέων γράμματα. *Euf. Pr. Ev.* l. 9. 32. B. the Ὑπομνήματα of *Hierombaal* Priest of the God *Jevo. ib.* p. 31. the Ὑπομνήματα of their Cities, and the Ἀναγραφαὶ of their Temples, *Ib.* But as so great Recommendations of *Fidelity*, of *Antiquity*, and sufficient means of *Information*

Appian, Præf. *Dion. Halicarn.* L. 1. *Philo* ap. *Steph. Bz.*

Philo Byblius ap. *Euf.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. 31. D.

mation, must needs make him very useful for the Discovery of many and momentous *Truths*, if justly challenged; so, on the contrary, must they make his Authority very mischievous for seducing those who trust it, into numerous and dangerous *Errors*, if they should after all be found *False* and *Groundless*. Let us see therefore, whether these challenges be as *just* as they are specious and *plausible*

§. III. AND here I consider First, that all these Arguments of his Credibility depend, as to Us, either on the pure Testimony of *Porphyry*, who was the first who produced him with any great applause and confidence, and who is therefore justly suspicious, if not of wholly coyning him, yet at least of a partial favour to him, and of the first endeavours to justifie and defend him after the neglects that had been cast upon him since the time that he had first been Published and Translated by *Philo Byblius*, or else of *Philo Byblius* himself. *Athenæus* is the only Author extant that quoted him, that we know of, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*, supposing that the Σανιαθων, whose *Phœnician* Antiquities are quoted by him, and joyned with *Mochus* another very Antient *Phœnician* Writer often taken notice of, were the

Athen. Deipnos. L. 3.

he ſame with our *Sanchoniathon*, as he is ommonly conceived to be, and I believe, ot improbably, though he in *Athenæus* was a *Tyrian*, ours a *Berytian*, a difference ot very difficultly reconcileable, as has een ſhewn. If it ſhould prove otherwiſe, hen *Porphyry* alone muſt anſwer for both, ot only the pretended *Sanchoniathon* imſelf, but the pretended *Greek* Tranſlaion alſo of him by *Philo Byblius*. But o allow him all the favour that is reaſonble, and to grant that this *Philo Byblius* s to be ſuſpected of the Original fraud, ecauſe of this more Antient citation of im by *Athenæus*, which could have been om none but *Philo Byblius*; yet *Porphyry* uſt needs be looked on as the *retriever* f a *neglected*, and therefore *ſuſpicious* uthor, who muſt have been by that time ery Famous, if he had been thought enuine, which is very conſiderable for y preſent purpoſe.

§. IV. FOR I conſider further, that as he Principles both of the *Pythaoræans* and *Platoniſts* (who were oth of them admired by *Porphyry* llowed the Lawfulneſs of *Medicinal* falſehoods, as they called them hich was no doubt the Original ſt of thoſe *Mythological* Stories

For the *Pythagoræans*, ſee *Tim.* Locr. περ. φύσ. κόσμ. For the *Platoniſts*, *Plato* himſelf *de Rep.* L. 3. v. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Ruff.* L. 1.

with

with which they first beautified their *Dialogues*, then of all those *Forgeries* which were afterwards introduced by the *Monks*, who from their first Institution were of a *Philosophical* Extraction and Genius; I say besides these *Principles* which may let us see that it was *possible* he *might* deal disingenuously with us; the *occasion* of his first producing him, and his *design*, were such as may make him further suspicious of using the utmost liberty of his Principles *actually*. For it was purposely to confront the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures*, and in that very work which was designed to overthrow the Credit of *Christianity*. The like I shall (*) hereafter observe concerning *Philo Byblius*.

See the words of *Porphyry* in *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. X. 9. *Theodoret* Therap. 11.

* §. 36.

§. V. BUT that I may not therefore conclude him guilty of a disingenuous *Fact*, only because it was agreeable, not only to *Principles*, but his *Design*, and *Interest*; Let us consider the thing it self, and see whether it be likely that either *Sanchoniathon*, or his Translator *Philo Byblius*, were ever had in any esteem till *Porphyry* vouched for them. If they were, how comes it to pass that none but *Athenæus* should take notice of an Author so extreamly

treamly valuable, if he had been genuine! How comes it to paſs, that thoſe few *Chriſtians* that mention him afterwards ſhould quote him only at the *Second hand* from *Euſebius*, or at the uttermoſt from *Porphyry*? Why had they not rather recourſe to *Philo Byblius* himſelf, if he had been common? And what imaginable reaſon is there why he ſhould not have been *Common*, eſpecially in thoſe Eaſtern parts ſo near *Phœnicia*, if he had been valued, or thought genuine? Yet (a) *Theodoret* it ſeems had never ſeen him, but only in *Euſebius*. (b) St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was ſo far from quoting what he had occaſion to produce out of him from the Original of *Philo Byblius*, as that his memory, on which he ſeems to have quoted him from *Euſebius*, betrayed him into ſeveral and great miſtakes. He firſt pretends to have had what he ſays concerning him from *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Stromata*. A plain ſign he had not ſeen *Philo Byblius* himſelf. Yet who can doubt but that he alſo miſtook *Clemens Alexandrinus* for *Euſebius*? It is certain there is no mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Tranſlator* in the *Stromata* of *Clemens* as we have them extant at preſent. Was it therefore in what is loſt? There are but two imperfections

(a) *Therap.* II. III. from *Euſ.* Pr.Ev.x.9.
(b) Cont. *Julian.*l.vi.

fections in the whole Work, the beginning of the *First* Book, and the *Eighth*. What was wanting in the beginning of the *First Book*, we know by what remains to have been nothing but Introduction, where he had yet no occasion of medling with the *Antiquity* of *Phœnician* Writers. Not in the *Eighth Book*, where by what he promises in the *Sixth*, we know he designed to answer the Heathens concerning the *Coming of our Lord*, that is, I suppose, concerning his *coming so lately*, and in so *mean appearance* (which were the Popular Objections of that Age) or else concerning his *Second coming* to Judge *Persecutors* and *Unbelievers*, which ordinarily concluded their *Controversial Writings*. So the Sacred Writers of the *New Testament* frequently. So St. *Cyprian*'s Second Book of *Testimonies*, *ad Quirin.* which seems to have been the *last* of that Work. So *Irenæus* in the last Chapters *adv. Hær.* So *Lactantius Lib. VII. Div. Inst.* *Phil.* *Commodianus* is more particularly large on this Argument. But neither of these could afford him any occasion of mentioning this Author. For none can doubt but what now, and in *Photius*'s time, possessed the place of the *Eighth* Book had no affinity with the Argument of

Strom. VI. p. 617. A.

Cod. cxi.

of this Work. And yet neither is there any mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Translator*. But to put the matter out of doubt that this was only a mistake of St. *Cyril*, as I said; where *Clemens* had indeed occasion to dispute the Question of *Antiquity* between the *Heathen* and the *Sacred* Writers, there he has not the least intimation of either of them; and the very words quoted by St. *Cyril* are exactly in *Eusebius*, but not as out of the Text of *Sanchoniathon*, but the *Preface* of *Philo Byblius*. Which he could not so easily have confounded if he had used the Book itself; but might very probably in borrowing them from *Eusebius*, who comprises all he or *Porphyry* had collected both out of the *Text* and the *Preface*, in the same Chapters immediately following each other. Besides *Porphyry* reckons but Eight Books of *Sanchoniathon de Abst.* II. *n.* 56. but *Eusebius* Nine, reckoning it seems the very Preface of *Philo* for a distinct Book. Which being quoted for *Sanchoniathon*'s by *Cyril*, shews that he follows the very division of *Eusebius*, and therefore took what he had from him.

Stromat. I.

Pr. Ev. l. 9.

Bochart conceives the *Physiology* or *Theogony* to have been a distinct Book from the History. But see what is said hereafter.

§. VI. BUT what is it he pretends to tell us from *Clemens Alexandrinus*? That

Sanchoniathon's Book was Tranſlated by *Joſephus*. But who ever mentions ſuch a *Tranſlation* amongſt the Works of *Joſephus*? How is it credible that he ſhould ſo far favour the cauſe of the *Phœnicians* who ſo profeſſedly maintains the greater *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* againſt them in his Books againſt *Appion*? And who can reconcile this pretended Teſtimony from *Clemens* with *Porphyry*, who certainly, if any, converſed with the Original Tranſlation? If he be to be credited, here are again two great miſtakes of St. *Cyril*, Firſt his miſtaking *Philo Byblius* for the famous *Alexandrian Philo* the *Jew*; then his confounding that *Philo* with *Joſephus* who was of the ſame Nation. Which again plainly ſhew, that he quoted him by *memory*, and at the *Second hand*.

§. VII. BUT beſides that this *ſilence*, or *Second hand* Quotations, even *after* the time he was divulged and applauded by *Porphyry*, are ſtrong ſuſpicions that he was either not known, or not regarded, (either of which are equally ſerviceable to my purpoſe;) yet further, what ſhould be the reaſon that ſo uſeful and Antient an Author ſhould be ſo little known even *before* the time of *Porphyry*? Was it becauſe he was locked up in the *Phœnician* Tongue

Tongue? But why ſhould he not at leaſt, have been better known after the *Greek* Tranſlation of him by *Philo Byblius?* Yet even then ſo little was he known that, were it not for the forementioned Teſtimony of *Athenæus*, we might juſtly doubt whether ſuch a Tranſlation was ever undertaken by that *Philo*. *Suidas* mentions this *Philo*, and reckons up others of his Works, and fixes his time. He places him near the Reign of *Nero*, and makes him Threeſcore and Eighteen Years old, at the Conſulſhip of *Severus Herennius* in *Olymp.* 220. Which if it be true muſt fall at leaſt about the Reign of *Trajan*, though no ſuch Conſulſhip appear in our preſent *Fact*, poſſibly becauſe he might have been either a *Suffectus*, or expunged out of the publick *Faſti* for ſome Crime. Nay, he expreſly makes him to have written concerning the Reign of *Hadrian*. And therefore, in all likelyhood the broken number of the odd *Olympiads* above Two Hundred and Twenty is wanting in *Suidas*. But what ground *Scaliger* had to fix the Year of the 229. *Olymp.* I do not underſtand. Yet no ſuch Tranſlation appears in that Catalogue of his Works, unleſs it were contained under the Ἄλλα.

Voce Φίλων.

Scaliger, in ὀλυμπιάδ. συναγωγ.

§. VIII. AND why ſhould he never have been mentioned by thoſe antient *Apologiſts* for the *Chriſtian* Religion who wrote before *Porphyry*? They had a juſt occaſion for it in that great Diſpute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* above all *Heathen* Authors. On this occaſion they drew up Catalogues of the Antienteſt *Heathen* Authors they knew of, yet *Sanchoniathon*, the moſt appoſite Inſtance of them all, never being ſo much as thought of. Not by *Juſtin Martyr* in the time of *Antoninus Pius*, though he was a *Samaritan*, and had thereby the opportunity to have known the famous Writers of his Neighbouring *Phœnicians*, nay to have underſtood them though they had not been Tranſlated to his hand. Yet he knew of nothing *Antient* either amongſt the *Greeks* or the *Barbarians*. Which how could he have ſaid if he had known any thing of this moſt Antient *Sanchoniathon*? Not by *Theophilus Antiochenus* in the time of *Verus*, with whom he ends his Chronology, though he were nearer the *Phœnicians* than the *Græcians*, nay and had ſpecial occaſion in mentioning the *Phœnician* Antiquities. Not by *Tatianus* the Scholar of St. *Juſtin*, and ſo not long, if at all, after him, when he wrote his *Oration*

Οὐδ' ὅτι τὸ σύγγραμμα παλαιὸν, Ἑλλήνων ἢ Βαρβάρων σημαῖνον πρᾶξιν. Juſt. Mart. Paræn. p. 13.

Ad Autolyc. L. III.

tion against the *Greeks* (it does not appear that St. *Justin* was then dead, though I know how *Tatianus* is mistaken by *Eusebius*, who has also generally deceived the Learned who have followed him) though he was an *Assyrian*, and takes particular notice of the Antientest *Græcian* and *Phœnician* Authors, and names all the most Antient *Phœnicians* that he knew of, which were but Three, *Theodotus*, *Mochus* and *Hypsicrates*. Not by *Clemens* as has already been observed, who deduces his computation to the death of *Commodus*, though he also had occasion, in disputing that same Controversie concerning the Age of the most Antient Heathen Writers. I think St. *Cyril*'s mistake concerning him, has been sufficiently discovered and convicted. Not by *Tertullian* in the times of *Severus* and *Caracalla*, though he had also the like occasion given him in his *Apology*. Not by *Origen*, though he refers to *Josephus* against *Appion*, and *Tatianus* for a Collection of such *Phœnician* Authors as had mentioned any thing concerning *Jewish* Affairs; nay mentions *Herennius Philo* who had written concerning the

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. IV. 16. He only says that *Crescens* had endeavoured the death of St. *Justin* (πραγματεύεται is his Word) but he has not the least intimation that it was in his power to accomplish it. What he says was only taken from *Justins* own words in his *Apology*. *Or.* adv. *Græc.* p. 171. & ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. X. 2. p. 493. *Strom.* 1.

Apolog. c. 19.

C. *Cels.* lib. 1. p. 13, 14.

Jews, if this be the *Philo* to whom the Translation of *Sanchoniathon* is ascribed by *Porphyry*, as in all likelyhood he is the *Philo* mentioned by *Suidas*, who had said of himself that his Sir-name was *Herennius*. And the Title of *Herennius Philo* is given him in the Inscription of a *M. S.* Work of his on *Aristotles Metaphysicks*, now in the Library of the most accomplished and truly Great Dr. *Isaac Vossius*. And my very Dear and very Learned Friend Dr. *Lloyd* conceives that he might have borrowed that Sir-name of *Herennius* from his Patron *Herennius Severus* the Consul, which was usually for *Liberti* to * do in those times; and that the Consul was the same with him mentioned in *Pliny*, *Ep. Lib.* iv. 28. who there appears to have been a Lover of Learning, and himself a very Learned Person. The Times do very well agree; and it is not otherwise easie to conceive how *Philo* a *Phœnician* should come by a *Roman* Name. And that he was very intimate with that Consul appears both by his dating his own Age by his

*When they were made *Liberti* they were not only made *Romans*, but taken into the *Families* of their *Patrons*, as appears from the *Inscriptions* of their *Family Sepulchres*, which were generally conceived in that Form, *FILIIS ET FILIABUS, LIBERTIS ET LIBERTABUS POSTERISQUE EORUM*. And then how proper was it for them to receive the *Gentile* name of their *Patrons Family?*

his *Patrons Consulship* and by his bringing *Hermippus* his Country-man and Scholar acquainted with him. Yet even on this occasion, *Origen* makes no mention of his *Sanchoniathon* among those *Phœnician* Writers which he immediately refers to as mentioning *Jewish* Affairs. How could he have slipt such an opportunity as this was, of mentioning him, if he had known him? Not even by *Celsus* himself, whom *Origen* places under *Hadrian*, though he must certainly have lived later if he be the same to whom *Lucian* dedicated his *Pseudomantis* after the death of *Marcus Antoninus* whom he calls Θεὸς, nay must have written this very Work against the *Christians* later than *Hadrian*, for (1) *Marcellina* and (2) *Marcion*, both of them mentioned by him, as they first broached their *Heresies* under *Anicetus*, so most probably after the death of *Hadrian*. *Philo* was as his work mentioned by *Origen* shews him, sufficiently disaffected to the *Jews*, so that if he did Translate any such work of *Sanchoniathon*, he would most probably have designed it as *Porphyry*, to confront the Antiquity of the *Jews*. And how greedily would *Celsus* have seconded him if he had known of any such work Published by him? Thus it appears that this

See *Suid.* in Ἑρμιππ.

(1) ap. *Orig.* L. v. p. 272

(2) ap. *Orig.* L. vi. p. 326. & ubi supra.

this *Sanchoniathon* was either generally not known, or (which amounts to the same thing) generally neglected by all sorts of Authors, both *Christians* and *Heathens* too, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*.

§. IX. BUT to ascend yet higher, what should hinder him from being known even before *Philo Byblius*, if he had been what he is pretended? It is true, he could neither have been known nor deservedly valued by the *Greeks* till he was Translated. But what imaginable cause is there why he was not Translated more Antiently? The *Phœnician Records*, and *Histories* had been searched and translated and divulged by *Hieronymus Tyrius*, *Menander Ephesius* and *Dius*, *Hestiæus* and *Philostratus* and others; nay the very Original Records themselves are quoted by *Josephus*, and the Original Copies of the Epistles between *Solomon* and *Hiram* are still mentioned as extant in their *Archives* by the same *Josephus* and *Theophilus Antiochenus*. How comes it to pass they should all of them overlook this most considerable, most creditable Author? Why should they omit this most Antient account of their most Antient Times, when the great design of all these Enquiries seems to have been

Vid. *Bochart.* Chanaan L. 11. c. 17. *Joseph.* Ant. viii. 2. c. *Appion.* L. 1.

Theoph. Ant. L. III. ad *Autolyc.*

been a General Dispute concerning the most Antient Nations? Why did they not translate him then? Why did they not, at least, take out of him, and vouch him for their Authority? Had they done so, why should not *Josephus* have had recourse to him, if not in his *Phœnician* Original, yet at least as to those particulars they had borrowed from him? Why does he never mention him either in his *Antiquities*, or his Books against *Appion*, especially in those things which he relates concerning *Abraham*, which he was particularly careful to confirm by the best Testimonies he knew of. Ant. l. 8.

§. X. *Sanchoniathon* had been useful even to those who had enquired only for their *Histories*. But consider we him further as a *Philosopher*; for such the Writers of the Θεογονίαι and especially of the Κοσμογονίαι whereof much of *Sanchoniathon*'s Work consisted, were then reputed, that being the usual *Mystical* way whereby they concealed the secrets of their *Natural Philosophy*. So also *Suidas* Σαγχωνιάθων. Τύριος Φιλόσοφος. Indeed the θεολογία seems to have been the same with the Κοσμογονία. For what *Eusebius* had called the θεολογία of the *Phœnicians Pr. Ev. l.* 9. that he calls their Κοσμογονία *c.* 10. To which he adds the

Ζωογονία

ζωογονία also for compleating it. For both these were pretended to be taken from the Κοσμογονία of *Taautus*. Yet even so, there were several fair occasions of discovering, and Translating him, Antienter than *Philo*. For their Antientest *Philosophers* had been also enquired into long before *Philo*. What was *Pythagoras*'s design in Travelling amongst them? Was it only to see their Countries and their Fashions? Was it not rather to acquaint himself with their *Philosophical* Improvements? And would he, who is so much celebrated for his Conversation with the *Phœnician Prophets*, the Posterity of *Mochus*, not rather have employed his time in inquiring after this equally, if not more, Antient both *Historian* and *Philosopher Sanchoniathon*? After the *Macedonian* Conquests had opened an access for the *Greek Philosophers* to the *Phœnician Archives*; they then Translated as many as were valued by them. *Theodotus* and *Hypsicrates* and *Mochus* were Translated by *Asitus* or *Chætus* as *Tatianus* tells us; and the same concerning *Mochus* and many others appear from *Strabo*. How comes *Sanchoniathon*, if there had then been any such Author extant, to have escaped their diligence?

Jamblich. de vita *Pythag.*

Orat. adv. *Græc. Chætus.* But *Asitus* is a fragment of the Oration, as quoted by *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. X. 11. But *Bochart* corrects it *Lætus*, and rightly *Geogr. Lib.* XVI.

§. XI. He

§. XI. HE pretends to have had his Information from the Writings of *Taautus*, from the *Mystical* Books of the *Ammonians*, and the Ὑπομνήματα or *Memoires* of *Jerombaal*, the *Priest* of the God *Jevo*, the Ὑπομνήματα of the *particular Cities* and the Ἀναγραφαὶ of their *Temples*. Things very considerable indeed, if they had been truly pretended to. But let us see whether there be any reason to believe them on his credit. It was indeed a very Antient way of preserving knowledge to inscribe what they would preserve in *Pillars* to be kept in the *Temples* of their most Eminent Gods, the better to be secured from *Weather* and the *Violence* of Prophane hands. Thus they did with their *Laws*, with their *Leagues* and *Covenants*, with their *Histories*, and their *Arts* and *Sciences*. Instances might have been given of all these sorts, if I had thought it necessary. Particularly, for *Histories* there was that of *Euemerus* from the *Inscriptions* in the *Temple* of *Jupiter Triphylius*; for *Arts*, those from whence *Callisthenes* gave *Aristotle* an account of the *Eclipses* observed by the *Chaldæans*, those of the same *Babylonians* referred to by *Epigenes*, *Berosus* and *Critodemus*, and the Famous

Vid. *Plutarch* de Isid. & Osirid. *Lactant.* Div. Inst. L. 11.

Ap. *Simpl.* in *Arist.* de Cælo. L. 11. Com. 16.

Plin. Nat. Hist. vii. 56.

ous *Pillars* of *Seth* mentioned by *Josephus*. Out of such *Pillars* as these no doubt the Publisher of *Sanchoniatho* would have us believe his History to have been gathered. Nor was it unusual for *Deceivers* to impose on the World on the credit of such *Pillars*. *Euemerus* now mentioned was looked on by Antiquity as a Famous instance of it. For it was certainly the easiest way for broaching False-hoods. These were *Monuments* which could be produced on the *sudden* concerning the most *remote* Antiquities without the attestation of Antient *Writings*, because themselves were supposed to be *Originals* of the times they pretended to give account of; were supposed remote from Vulgar *Knowledge* or *understanding*, being either kept in the *Adyta*, or locked up in some absolute unknown *Character*, which none but the *Learned* and the *Priests* could understand; were contrived in *Hieroglyphicks* or such *ambiguous* notes as were capable of what *Interpretation* those designing Persons who produced them were pleased to put upon them; depended generally on *Oral Tradition*, than which there is not a more unfaithful *Conveyer* of Monuments to *Posterity*; depended wholly on the credit of the

Plutarch. de Isid. & Osirid. p. 360.

he *Priests*, being withal generally inte-
ested in the things thus preserved, making
or the *credit* of their false *Religion*, or
he *credit* of their *Nation*, for *Antiquity*,
r rare *Inventions*; were to be found and
amined only in *one place* (not like *Books*
very where) nor even there it self with-
ut the Leave and Directions of such in-
ressed *Priests*. Upon this account their
ry *humoured* Stories with which it was
shionable in those times to adorn their
Dialogues, were grounded on the credit
f such pretended *Inscriptions*. So *Cebes*'s
able, and the *Samothracian Inscriptions*
ferred to by *Axiochus*, and those con-
rning the *Atlantides* in *Timæus*.

§. XII. AND thus it was generally in
e disingenuous dealings of those Nati-
s, which upon the appearing of the
wish Scriptures in the common Tongue,
gan to rival them, and one another for
tiquity. Thus the *Babylonians* in *De-*
ocritus preserved their *Moral Discourses*
the *Pillars* of *Acicarus*. Thus *Xisu-*
us in *Berosus* is said to have preserved
e *Chaldæan* Inventions Ingraven in
ates from the Deluge. Thus *Manetho*
tended to have gathered his new *Dy-*
sties from the like *Pillars* of *Mercury*.
Cham is pretended to have preserved
his

Clem Alex. Strom. 1. p. 303.

Euseb. Gr. p. 6.

Cassian. Coll. viii. 21.

his inventions in *Judicial Astrology* by the like invention of Ingraving them in Plates, which Plates they usually fastned to *Pillars*; from whence I am apt to think that the *Gnosticks* might take occasion to forge that *Prophecy* which was among them obtruded in those times under his Name. And as *Ægyptian* Notions were the Principal ingredient in most of those Antient *Heresies* that were comprehended under the common Name of *Gnosticks*, so I am apt to think that *Chemi* the Antient Name of *Ægypt* gave them occasion to father what they pleased on a Scripture Patriarch of a Name that had some affinity to it, besides that the *Scripture* it self calls *Ægypt* so often the Land of *Ham*, so that the Inscriptions of *Cham* and *Mercury* were probably the very same. The like also conceive concerning the *Pillars* of *Seth* aforementioned from *Josephus*. Nor is the mistake so difficult as may be imagined. It is very well known that the *Dog-star* was by the *Ægyptians* called (1) *Sothis*; That the revolution of their *great year* was accordingly from it called *Sothiaca* (2) *Periodus*, because the *Dog-star* then returned exactly to the very same place where he had been before. That their *great year* was therefore called

Clem. Alexandrin. Strom. VI. p. 642. A.

Plutarch. de *Isid.* & *Osirid.*

(1) *Horus Apoll.* c. 3. *Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osi.* *Chalcidius, in Pla. Timæum* malè σολεχῶ. *Porphyr.* de antr. Nymphar.

(2) *Clem. Alexand.* Strom. I. p. 335. C.

ικὸς or *Canicularis*, as *Censorinus* tells s, because it began exactly on the first ay of that Month on which the *Dog-star* ose, which was the *Ægyptian Thoth.* Who sees not that the whole contrivance f that Year was exactly fitted to the ourse of that *Star?* And that therefore *Thoth* was reckoned for the first Month the Year because the *Dog-star* rose in ? If therefore its Name were given it with any design, it seems to have been herefore called *Thoth* because their *Sothis* ose in it, and therefore that those two Names are indeed designed for the same. Nor is the change of *S* and *Th* either difficult or unusual in those Tongues, as might have been shewn by multitudes of Examples if I had leisure.

De die nat. c. 18.

§. XIII. BUT whether the Name of *Thoth* and *Sothis* were Originally the ame or not; yet it seems clear that the Notions of *Mercury* were inscribed to *Sothis.* So *Manetho's Sacred History* (in he same Sense no doubt, that *Ennius's* Translation of *Euemerus's* History, pretended also from *Sacred Pillars* was also called *Sacred*) is called the Βίβλος Σώθεως in *Euseb. ib.* And, which yet comes more fully home to what I am now proving, the very Name Σὼθ is used in this matter

Lactant. Div. Inst. L. 1. c. 11.

 from

from *Petosiris* an *Ægyptian* Writer, by *Vettius Valens*, *Antiochenus* in *Scaliger* and others, and that in the *Masculine Gender*. But this whole matter will be yet plainer if we remember that the design of *Manetho* (1) was to fit his *Chronology* to that *Sothiac Period*. We see it accordingly prevailed in most of the later *Ægyptian Chronologies*, which pretended to any more than ordinary *Exactness*. So the *Destruction* of *Troy* is noted in *Clem.* (2) *Alexandrinus*, most probably from an *Egyptian* Author. So were the years of *Nabonassar* in *Ptolomies Canon*, and the *Babylonian Eclipses* fitted to the same *Canicular year* by (3) *Hipparchus*. Now this *Sothiac Period* was purposely invented to give a full and exact account of the *Suns* course, till he was to rise exactly in the same place of the *Zodiac* where he had risen before. For proceeding on this *Hypothesis* that the true *Solar Year* consisted of 365 days and $\frac{1}{4}$, this Fourth was not intercalated every Fourth Year, as in the *Julian* account, but permitted to run on (purposely that their Festivities might pass through the whole Year) till those Fourth parts of a *Day* made up a whole *Year*, which they did in 1461. *Egyptian*, equivalent to 1460. *Julian* Years. That this was purposely designed

In loc *Eus.* Chr. Græc. p. 6.

(1) So *Concharis* is reckoned in the xvi. *Dynasty* τῶν Κυνικῶν λεγομένων Κύκλων τῶν Μανεθῶ. *Syncell.* p. 103. C.

(2) *Strom.* I.

(3) *Ptol.* L. iv. c. ult. p. 104.

designed to signifie the Course of the *Sun*, appears from their calling the whole Period by the Name of (*) *Annus* Ἡλιακὸς, and ὁ Θεὸς ἐνιαυτὸς, as the Name of Θεὸς simply taken, signifies the *Sun* in *Antient Authors*. But the *Sun*, whose Course this was, was called *Typhon*, as *Typhon* was also called *Seth*, as *Plutarch* (*) assures us. Accordingly as most of the *Egyptian* Names of *Persons* and *Places* were taken from their *Gods*, so we have still footsteps of this *Gods* name in the *Names* of *Sethron*, *Sethos*, *Sethosis*, &c. And then it cannot be thought strange, that as his whole *Book* is denominated from his *Chronological Period*, so that *Period* it self should be ascribed to the *Egyptian Seth*, and consequently the *Pillars* also from which these accounts were taken. It may be another account may be given of this matter, that by the *Pillars* of *Seth* may be meant only their belonging to *Egypt*. So it appears that the same King who was called *Egyptus* by the *Greeks*, was by the *Egyptians* themselves

(*) *Censor.* ded. natal. 18.

(*) Οἱ δὲ τοῖς δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ τὰ ἀπ' Ἀστρολογίας Μαθηματικῶν ἔνια μιγνύντες Τυφῶνα μὲν ὅλον καὶ τὸν Ἡλιακὸν κόσμον. *Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osirid.* p. 367. C. And a little after: Διὸ τὸν Τυφῶνα Σὴθ δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν, ὅπερ ὀνομα καταδυνασευον ἢ καταβιαζόμενον. Where we have the *signification* of *Seth* in the *Egyptian Tongue*, and the reason why the *Sun* and *Typhon* were called so. Again, Τὸ Σὴθ αὐτὸν Τυφῶνα καλοῦσι φράζει μὲν τὸ καταδυνασευον καὶ καταβιαζόμενον. p. 371. B. Again ὁ δὲ Τυφῶν (ὥσπερ εἴρηται) Σὴθ. p. 376. A.

ſelves called *Sethos*, and as it ſeems from thence concluded by *Manetho* to have been the ſame with him whom the *Greeks* called *Ægyptus* the Brother of *Danaus*, (who neither was himſelf known to the *Ægyptians*, by the name of *Danaus* but *Armais*) becauſe *Sethos* in the *Ægyptian* Tongue, ſignified the ſame thing as *Ægyptus* in the *Greek*. Now the Name of *Egypt* was derived from the Name of *Ægyptus*, by which he was known to the *Greeks*, and therefore proportionably the Name of *Sethos* muſt have derived the like denomination of *Sethos* to his *Country*. So *Theophilus Antiochenus* from *Manetho*: Ἀιγυπτος ἡ χώρα ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Σέθως τὸν γὰρ ΣΕΘΩΣ φασὶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΣ καλεῖσθαι. Which, being once admitted, will open a further way of expounding *Joſephus*'s γῆν Συριάδη, which muſt be reconciled with the place where the *Mercurial Pillars* were placed by *Manetho*, and is by him called Σηριαδικὴ. And to derive this yet higher, the uſual occaſion theſe emulous Nations took for challenging the glorious *Actions* or *Perſons* of each others to themſelves, was when themſelves alſo had *Actions* or *Perſons* of the ſame *Name*. Now *Heliopolis* in *Egypt* was Famous for thoſe *Mercurial Writings*. And

Theoph. Antioch. L. III. ad Autolyc.

Ant. l. 3.

And therefore they who were ambitious of challenging them to themſelves, were to take occaſion of doing ſo from a *Heliopolis* of their own. Accordingly the *Chaldæans*, for their *Xiſuthrus* pitched on *Heliopolis* in *Sippara*, and the *Phœnicians* had their *Heliopolis* at Mount *Libanus*, a *Sacred* place, and particularly Famous for their *Baitulia*. And when they had, on this pretence, claimed *Mercury* as their own, the change was very obvious, from Σπειαδικὴ to Συειαδικὴ, for them who were willing from thence to conclude, that theſe *Mercurial Pillars* were to be expected only in *Syria*, where their *Heliopolis* was placed. The very Analogy of *Grammar* is ſufficient to ſhew that it was a *willful* and *deſigned* variation. Συειακὴ had indeed been *Greek*, but γῆ Συειάδι, though in the Dative Caſe, ſeems to have been a change from Συειαδικῇ, as that alſo from Σπειαδικῇ, on the deſign now mentioned. And there is ſtill a footſtep of Σπειαδικὴ as the Antienteſt Reading in *Joſephus*, that *Euſtathius* reads it Σπϊρειάδι, *Hexaem.* And this very Origination of this *Word* is a ſtrong Preſumption that Συειαδικὴ rather than Συειγγικὴ (as ſome Learned Perſons would have it from *Ammian*) is indeed an Antient Reading

Bochart. Chanaan L. 11. c. 2.

Ammian Marcellin. l. 22. *Val-s.* in loc. Sir *John Marsham.* Chro. Can. Sec. 1. p. 39. Ed. *Lips.*

in *Josephus.* That I may not now mention the Antient *Translation* of *Josephus* by *Cassiodore*, and as many of the *Antients* as followed either *that* or the *Greek* near those times, who generally take it for *Syria* on the account now mentioned. I confess I cannot easily distrust *Ammian* in what he says concerning those *Syringes*, where those *Sacred Hieroglyphical* Inscriptions were, which were designed to be preserved from a *deluge*, because he pretends to write *visa pleraque*, what he had seen with his own Eyes. I confess I am apt to think that these *Syringes*, were the places designed for the so much celebrated *Pillars* of *Mercury*, though these Inscriptions were in *Vaults under ground* (those were properly *Syringes*) and in *Walls* rather than *Pillars* (though I know how largely the Notion of σήλαι may be understood) because I cannot think they had them in two places, for that same reason of preserving them from the *Deluge*. Yet the Country where they were, might have been called *Seriadica*, and that it was so, we have, before *Josephus*, the more Antient Testimony of *Manetho*. Besides it is considerable, that the Doctrine of the two Destructions of the World, one by *Fire*, another by *Water*, which is pretended

Ib. p. 413.

tended as the occasion of erecting these two *Pillars*, is originally *Ægyptian*. And they, no doubt on pretence of such *Pillars*, boasted themselves alone to have preserved their *Histories*, through the several *Deluges* and *Conflagrations*. And from this confounding the *Babylonian* and *Ægyptian* accounts, which followed upon their several respective *Emulations*, I suppose it was, that these Inventers of the Fable of *Seth*, were so particular in telling us the very *materials* of those *Pillars*. The *Ægyptian Syringes* were, as it appears from *Ammian* cut out of a *Quarrey*, and therefore were of solid stone. But the *Babylonian* mentioned by *Epigenes* were *Coctilibus Laterculis*, for which that place was Famous. These two so well fitting the design of preserving them from the *Conflagration* and the *Deluge*, made them, who were willing to confound things for Interests of their own, to be as I said so very particular, not considering that by the account given in *Plato's Timæus*, the *Ægyptians* had another pretence of preserving their own *Inscriptions* from the *Conflagration* as well as from the *Deluge*.

Vid. *Platon* in *Tim.* qui ea habuit ab *Ægyptiis*.

Ammian, L. xxiii.

Ap. *Plin.* N. H. vii. 56.

§. XIV. SO also, for the *Writings* from whence our *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have collected his History, there seems

little doubt but they were alſo deſigned for the ſame with thoſe of *Mercury*; as alſo that the Subject of theſe *Writings*, were taken from thoſe *Plates* and *Pillars* now mentioned. *Philo Byblius* himſelf expreſly ſays, that *Sanchoniathon* enquired very careſully into the Notions of *Taautus*; That *Taautus*, to whom they were aſcribed, was no other than (*) *Mercury*, will, I believe, need no proof. And theſe *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians* being joyned with them, makes it yet more probable. For even among our preſent Counterfeits under the Name of *Mercury*, we have an Epiſtle of *Aſclepius* to *Ammon*, concerning the Concealment of their *Philoſophical Myſteries*, with ſeveral other Fragments of the like addreſs in *Stobæus Eclog. Phyſ.* by which we ſee that thoſe unfaithful dealers with *Hermes*, did both joyn this *Ammon* with him whom they make a King in *Libya* (very probably with ſome relation to the Famous *Libyan* Oracle of *Jupiter Ammon*) and withal, made the ſame *Ammon* a very zealous Patron of thoſe *Philoſophical Myſteries*. So that this holds exact correſpondence with thoſe other Cheats, and looks as if it belonged to the ſame Forge. Unleſs poſſibly we may refer it to that more

(*) *Philo Byblius* ſays ſo expreſly in *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. A.

more Antient Conjunction of *Thoth* and *Thomuz*, and the God of the *Ægyptian Thebes*, called *Ammon* in *Plato* himself, whence it comes to pass that the *Ægyptian Thebes* has, in the Prophets, the Name of *No-Ammon*, as it was usual, and, as *Diodorus* observes most proper to the *Ægyptians*, to denominate their *Cities* from their *Deities*. It may be this may be the reason why the Name of *Ammon* is so usually made use of in the accounts of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*, because the Name it self seems an off spring of *Ham*, ascribed in the Scripture to the Land of *Ægypt* it self, so that the *Ammonian Philosophy* is no more than a *Colony* of the *Ægyptian*. And these Ἀπόκρυφα γράμματα, these *Mystical Writings* were most properly ascribed to this God, whose very *Name*, as *Manetho* expounds it, signified in the *Ægyptian Tongue*, τὸ κεκρυμμένον καὶ κρύψιν. How much more proper an *Etymology* is this, than that which *Bochart* gives elsewhere from the *Hebrew*, where his Interest for *Sanchoniathon*, obliges him to make these *Ammonian Writings Phœnician?*

In *Phædr.* p. 213.

Ap. *Plutarch.* de Is. & Osirid.

De *Phœn.* Col. 11. 17.

§. XV. But to examine now the Credibility of his pretence to these Means; it is first considerable that, seeing these *Records* were *Ægyptians*, it is not easie to explain

plain how *Sanchoniathon* himself, a Man of another Nation, could have access to them. The difficulty *Pythagoras* found notwithstanding the powerful recommendation of *Polycrates* to *Amasis* who was his *Hospes*, shews how averse they were to communicate their *Mysteries* to *Foreigners*. But it was not at all to be expected by Persons *uncircumcised*, as the *Phœnicians* were undoubtedly in the pretended Age of *Sanchoniathon*. But supposing he had Conquered the difficulties of access, and submitted, as *Pythagoras* seems to have done, to Circumcision; yet the *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians*, and much more the *Mystical Hieroglyphicks* of the *Ægyptians* (of which kind the Sacred *Inscriptions* of their *Pillars* generally were) depended still on a higher degree of *good will* and *fidelity* of the *Priests* for their *Explication*. And who can undertake that they would, after all, deal *Faithfully* with him? Especially if they had suspected the least design in him of committing them to *Writing*, and *divulging* them to Posterity? And after all, what judicious Person would not rather enquire for this Information *Originally* from the *Ægyptians* themselves? Who would not rather have trusted *their present* sense

Porphyr. de vit. *Pythag.* p. 183. vid. Not. *Holsten.*

ſenſe in which they were agreed, even in *later* times, than ſuch *Second-hand* Relations concerning the ſenſe of their *Anceſtors*? And then, what will become of this ſo much applauded Teſtimony of *Sanchoniathon*, if *Phœnician* matters muſt not be expected from him, as they could not from ſuch means of Information; and if the Teſtimony even of the *later Ægyptians* muſt be preferred before him? I am very well aware that the whole credit of this Author depends on the contrary ſuppoſition, that both theſe *Pillars* of *Taautus*, and *Apocryphal Books* of the *Ammonians*, were in *Phœnicia*, and concerned *Phœnician* Affairs, and in the *Phœnician* Tongue or *Characters*, that a Native *Phœnician* might be preſumed fitteſt to underſtand them.

§. XVI. THIS will indeed, and will alone, make him ſo *credible* as he is thought to be. And it is plainly ſuppoſed in the Author himſelf, who makes *Hermes* a Native *Phœnician*, and to be made *King* of *Ægypt* by one that was. And this ſeems the moſt likely account how the *Pillars* of *Seth*, (which I ſaid ſeem to be the ſame with thoſe of *Mercury*) came to be placed by *Joſephus* in *Syria*, that he had met them placed there by

Apud Euſ. Pr. Ev. 1. 10. p. 36. A. 39. B.

by ſome who were thus in Intereſt, concerned to place them ſo, to juſtifie their other Factions. Beſides Γῆ Σπείαδιαν in *Manetho* was eaſily corrupted into Συειαδιαν in *Joſephus*, by them who were willing to have it ſo, as has already been obſerved. And the *Ægyptian* Name of *Seth*, ſo exactly agreeing with the *Hebrew* Name, was a likely *occaſion* of miſtake, and an *Argument* too, for them who had rather have him believed to be a *Hebrew* than an *Ægyptian*. But then againſt this I oppoſe all the contrary, both *Teſtimonies* and *Arguments* that might be produced to prove that *Hermes* was a Native *Ægyptian*, and that *Ægypt* was never ſo ſubdued by the *Phœnicians* as to receive, nor *Phœnicia* in ſuch a ſtrong and flouriſhing condition, as to give them a *King* of their own Nation. That is as many Teſtimonies, as there are or have been *Ægyptian* Writers, not only *after*, but *before* the publiſhing of this pretended *Sanchoniathon*; as many of them, at leaſt, as mention ſuch a Perſon as *Hermes*, as many of them as wrote before theſe Diſputes of Antiquity of Nations were ſtarted, as well as they who wrote afterwards, to abet parties now made, and to drive on deſigns by this time already formed to their hand.

and. The highest account of all the *Mercuries* in *Cicero's* time, that was given by them who had then the curiosity to enquire into the *Gods* of the *same Name*, amounted not to above five, and among them no mention of any one that was a *Phœnician*, a sign none such was so much as challenged by them, till this pretended *Sanchoniathon*. The same account is followed by others afterwards, by *Ampelius* and *Arnobius*, a sign that even *then* this fictitious *Phœnician* was not of that credit, as to be thought worthy to encrease the received Number. And these were sufficient to be opposed to the true *Sanchoniathon* himself. The Original Writings of *Taautus*, and the *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians* must have been theirs, and could have been Interpreted by none but them, if we will allow any thing to the concurrent Testimonies of *disinteressed* Antiquity. But how much more than sufficient are they to over-sway the *Vouchers* for *him*, and for all those *things* also which recommend him as so very creditable? How much Antienter? How much freer from design? That I may not now descend to Personal Comparisons.

De Nat. Deor. L. III.

Arnob. adv. Gent. L. iv.

§. XVII. BUT (possibly to avoid the difficulty to be supposed in understanding Writings

Writings of this Nature;) it is supposed that *Taautus* either *found* or *made* all things *clear*; that he Originally wrote them so whatever he wrote upon his own knowledge; that he *made* them so, where he did not, as in his discovery of these *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians*, from some Monuments of their own, concealed in their *Adyta*, and of difficult access, but yet procured and divulged by him; that he unriddled the Tales and *Allegories*, wherein they had been Originally concealed. But that the later *Priests* again retrived their *Mythologies* and Arts of concealment. That as for the *Mercurial* Books themselves the Son of *Thabion* was the first who turned them into *Allegory*, from whom they came to the *Greeks*. That many Generations afterwards *Surmubelus*, the *God* (I suppose so Sir-named like *Antiochus*, and *Diodorus Cronus* the *Philosopher*, from *Saturn*, and *Pior* the *Ægyptian* from *Apollo*, that I may instance also in *private Persons* who were *Sir-named* from *Gods*, not only *denominatively*,) and *Thuro* a Woman Sir-named *Chusarthis*, explained those *Allegories*. That by this means they might come clear to *Sanchoniathon* from *Writings*, without Personal Discoveries of the *Priests*, which

Sanchon. apud *Eus.* Pr.Ev.l. 9. p. 32. B.

Ap. *Eus.* ib.p.39.C.

ib.p.40.B.

was

was not to be expected. This seems contrived, as if it were on purpose to defend the Credit of these Informations.

§. XVIII. BUT how many things are here supposed no way consistent with the Notions of those times? We see it is acknowledged that the Arts of *concealment* of *Mysteries*, had been taken up and used before, because *Taautus* is said to have unriddled those of the *Ammonians*. And who know not how great a *Piaculum* it was thought to *divulge Mysteries*? How particularly Superstitious the *Antients* were that way, as appears from the Fables of *Phineus* and *Prometheus*? And (concerning the *Ægyptians*) from their Worship of *Harpocrates*? How it was Capital for the Person who endeavoured it, and how they would no doubt have *suppressed* such Publications of their *Mysteries* if it lay in their power to do so? How then could *Sanchoniathon* come by them who lived so many Ages after? Was it because they *could not* suppress all Copies of what had once escaped them at *first*, especially not such as were in the Hands of the *Phœnicians*, who were not obnoxious to their Jurisdiction? But would they, at least, have paid that *Honour* to the Memory of a Person guilty of a Crime then reputed

reputed so very *impious* as to make him a *God*? Would they not rather have erected *Pillars* to his disgrace (from whence came afterwards the popular notion of σηλιτεύειν) than borrowed all their *Sacred Rites* and *Inventions* from his *Books* or *Pillars*? Would they have ascribed all their *Solemnities* of *Religion* (as it appears they did from *Clemens Alexandrinus*) to such a *Prophaner* of their *Secrets*, to so impious a violator of their received Religion?

Strom. vi.

§. XIX. AND who indeed was more unlikely to have such an accusation laid to his charge, than he that was reputed the First Institutor of their *Religion*, the first Imposer of that Sacred *silence* which they took for so necessary a Duty of all that would pretend to be *Religious*? Why should they ascribe their *Hieroglyphicks* and their *Sacred Characters* to him, if they had not thought that he had invented them purposely for this concealment? But consider him even as the Inventor only of their *Letters* (an Invention expresly ascribed to him by this pretended *Sanchoniathon* himself) and they cannot shew it possible for him to make that discovery he is pretended to have made from the very *Writings* of the *Ammonians*. For all other

Sacrarum literarum peritos facit. Jul. Firmic. Mathes. Lib. III. c. 8.

Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 36. A.

other *Sacred* ways but *Letters*, were of so æquivocal signification, as nothing could be gathered from them without the *Oral Traditions* of their *Priests*. And therefore he could not have made so great Discoveries by *Books*, if himself were the first Inventor of *Letters*.

§. XX. BUT who is this Son of *Thabion*, who is said to have turned them back into *Allegories*, and from whom they came at last to the *Greeks*? I suppose *Agathodæmon*, or the Second *Mercury* the Father of *Tat*, who is said by *Manetho* to have translated the Books of the said *Elder Mercury* into *Greek*, but yet γράμμασιν ἱερογλυφικοῖς, that is in the *Sacred Ægyptian Letter*, contradistinct from that which was of common use, possibly that though the *words* were, yet the *Characters* might not be understood by the *Greeks* without the *Priests* assistance, which he also secured by placing them in the *Adyta*. All these things seem exactly to agree with the present Fragments of the *Mercurial* Writings in *Greek*, where the *Elder Mercury* is blamed by *Ammon* for divulging their *Mysteries*; where the *Second Mercury* is he who generally speaks in his *own* Person, the *Elder* is spoken of in the *Third*, and *Tat* is mentioned as his *Son*, and the Μυστήριον ἐπικεκρυμμένον is so often

Ap. *Euseb.* G. p. 6. Ed. *Scaliger.*

ten mentioned, where the very *Pillars* are mentioned, and that they were to be *divulged* to Posterity from those *Pillars*, as appears from a Fragment of them extant in *Stobæus*. Yet it does not appear that *Manetho* published that Text of those *Mercurial Books* he pretends to have used out of the *Sacred Ægyptian*, into the common *Greek* Character. That he might forbear to do as a *Priest*. Possibly *Numenius* might have contributed hereunto, who is therefore charged by his own *Heathen* Brethren for divulging *Mysteries*. Whoever did so, seems also to have enlarged those of *Manetho*, with other things he took for *Mercurial*, as will appear hereafter. However these very allusions to these *Greek Mercurials*, are sufficient to convict this pretended *Sanchoniathon* of *falsehood*, in the opinion of such as believe the *Mercurials* themselves to be *Forgeries*, and Forgeries much later than the time that *Sanchoniathon* pretends to. However, if they were again involved by this Second *Hermes*, how comes *Sanchoniathon* to have understood them? But if this *Surmubelus* and *Thuro* had extricated them before the time of *Sanchoniathon*, how comes *Orpheus* (who must have been *Elder* or contemporary with him, if he flourished at, or a little before, the War of *Troy*, and

Stob. Eclog. Phys.

Macrob. in somn. Scipion. L. 1. c. 2.

and who is generally ſuppoſed to have borrowed his Notions from the *Ægyptians*) not to have underſtood them free from *Allegories*, as well as this pretended *Sanchoniathon*? But to proceed.

§. XXI. HE is pretended alſo to have borrowed his Informations from *Hierombaal* the *Prieſt* of the God *Jevo*. There is little reaſon to doubt but that he meant *Gideon*, who was by his Father *Joaſh* Sir-named *Jerubbaal*. The putting of *H* before *Hebrew* Words beginning with *I* (that is, putting *Aſpirations* where in the Original, the *J* is Conſonant) is ſo common, that I believe none will doubt of it. Inſtances are very obvious, as in *Hieremias*, *Hieruſalem*, *Hiericho*, *&c.* And the M S. *Greek* μ is as eaſie to have been miſtaken for a *u*, which is their Mark for β. which is an ordinary occaſion of miſtake in multitudes of MSS. Eſpecially in the leſs skillful *Publiſhers* of Printed Books from MSS. and this Name is at this preſent Written *Jerobaal*, with an *o* in the Vulgar *Latin* Text, *Judg.* vi. 32. And almoſt as little reaſon is there to doubt, but that the Name *Jevo*, is only a *Greek* imitation of the *Tetagrammaton*, the middle and final *Aſpirations* being utterly unexpreſſible in the *Greek* Tongue. But

Jud. vi. 32.

 neither

neither is this account of his Information, any thing more creditable than the others. How could *Gideon* be a *Priest*, who was of the Tribe of *Manasseh*? Was it on account of the *Ephod* which *Gideon* made? But where is there the least intimation that he wrote it himself? Nay, when he is said to have placed it in his own City of *Ephra*, it seems to imply, that it was placed there for another's wearing. And how comes it to pass, that the Scripture should pass it over in silence, that is so punctual in taking notice of Violations of the *Priesthood*, in matters of lesser consequence in *Jeroboam* and others? But how could *Sanchoniathon* have been guilty of such a mistake, in so fresh a memory of *Gideon*, in so near a Neighbourhood of the *Jews*, in a matter wherein then the meanest of them could have informed him, (so careful they were then to keep up the memory of their *Tribes*) if he had been so diligent in procuring Information, as is pretended? Suppose he had been so negligent himself; yet, how could King *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have *Dedicated* his Book? How could all his *contemporary Enquirers after Truth*, from all whom, he is pretended to have received commendations, be yet all so mistaken

Jud. viii. 27.

Οἱ καθ' αὐτὸν ἐξετασταὶ τῆς ἀληθείας Verba *Porphyrii* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9 31. A.

ſtaken in a thing of ſo eaſie Information? Yet to make this fancy concerning *Gideon's Prieſthood* look more likely, the excellent *Bochart* conceives that the *Baal Berith*, with whom the *Iſraelites* committed *Idolatry* after the death of *Gideon*, muſt have been the God of *Berytus*, *Sanchoniathon's* own City. But it ſeems moſt likely, that this *Baal Berith* was the *God* (not the *Goddeſs*) to whom *Gideon's Ephod* was Conſecrated, at his own City *Ephra*. That *Ephod* is ſaid to have been a *ſnare* to *Him* and his *Family*. And accordingly this *Baal Berith's* Temple, furniſhed the *Sichemites* with Arms in their Conſpiracy with *Abimelech*, which proved the ruin of the greateſt part of *Gideon's* Family. If ſo, then there was no ground to make this *Baal Berith* the ſame with *Jao*, to whom *Philo Byblius* would have us believe that *Gideon* was *Prieſt*. However, there is no probability that *Berith* (if it muſt needs be the name of a *place*) could be the ſame with *Berytus*. This *Berith*; where the *Sichemites* dwelt was in all likelyhood under the Dominion of the *Iſraelites*, but *Berytus* was in *Phœnicia*, and was in *Sanchoniathon's* time (if we may believe *Philo Byblius*) under a diſtinct *King* from *Iſrael*. Beſides the dif-

Ph. Col. 11. 17.
Judg. viii. 33.
Judg. viii. 27.
Judg. iv. 4.

ferent ways of writing these words in the *Hebrew*, gives little occasion for such a mistake. The *Phœnician Berytus* was so called as *Stephanus* tells us, rather from בארות διὰ τὸ ἔνυδρον, βῆρ γὰρ τὸ φρέαρ παρ' αὐτοῖς. And it is observable, that *Stephanus* seems to have taken what he had concerning these *Phœnician* places, from *Philo Byblius* himself, as might have been shewn in several Instances, and is on another occasion confessed by *Bochart* himself. If this were taken from him also, then it will at least follow, that this affinity between the *Names* of *Berith* and *Berytus*, could have been no occasion of mistake to *Philo Byblius*. Which as to our present purpose, is of much greater consequence, than what that same Learned Person observes from *Nonnus*, who takes *Berytus* for *Beroe*, the Daughter of *Venus* and *Adonis*. This therefore, looks like one of those ill-meant Blunders, which those Modern *Greeks* were ordinarily guilty of in the *Jewish* History, who pretended, no doubt from the like Records, to give other accounts of them, than their own writings had done of themselves, only with a design to asperse their Nation. Thus *Moses* is made a Woman, called *Moso* by *Alexander Polyhistor*. *Moses* and *Joseph* are joyned

Phœn. Col. 11, 12.

Suid. Μωσὼ. ap. *Joseph.* c. Ap. 1. 1057.

joyned together as *contemporaries* in *Chæremon*: But *Moses* is the Son of *Joseph* in *Trogus Pompeius*, Epitomiz'd by *Justin*. Many more Instances might have been given, if it had been necessary. Nor will the Answer of *Bochart* serve to excuse him here. כהן may indeed alone signifie a *Prince* as well as a *Priest*. But when it is joined with the *God*, to whom he is said to have been *Priest*, that were alone sufficient to determine the signification, from any ambiguity of which it might otherwise have been capable. But besides I shall (*) hereafter have occasion to shew his design in making him a *Priest*, for recommending what he was to deliver on his *Testimony*.

Just. Hist. xxxvi. 2.

(*) §. 38.

§. XXII. BUT possibly his pretended *Memoires* of *Gideon*, might have given him the Title of *Priest*, and *Sanchoniathon* a *Stranger*, a likely occasion of such a mistake. If they did so, then this it self had been a sufficient Argument, that they could not have been *Gideon*'s. And then, what credit must that part of his History be of, which relyes on so uncreditable Informations? And indeed, how unlikely is it, that *Gideon* should have left such *Memoires* behind him? In all likelyhood, what had come from him,

would have been *accounted Prophetical*; at least, if it had been undoubted, would have been made so by the attestation of the *Sanhedrim*, who were by God himself established for the Authentical *Judges* of *Prophets*. Which is the most defensible way for asserting the Divinity of the *Anonymous* Authors of the *Old Testament*. And if so, what probability had there been of their miscarriage? Nay, supposing them only *Human*, and of no higher repute among the *Jews*; yet, who can think they would have neglected so precious a Monument of their *Antiquity*, from so sure a hand as *Gideon*'s? But there is not the least *Memory* of such a Work among the *Jews*, not in their *Canonical Histories*; not in the multitudes even of *Counterfeits*, that were Antient, or were ever received, even among the *Hellenists*, of which we have any account, either in their Antient *Stichometriæ*, or in any Antient *Quotations*; not so much as in any *Quotation* of those *Canonical Writers* that lived near those times, and quote several extant then, which have since miscarried, as the Book of *Jasher*, of the *Wars of the Lord*, &c. Not even in the Book of *Judges*, where his Testimony had been most useful for continuing the *Jewish* History,

History, from the death of *Joshua*, to his own time. Can we think they would thus generally have neglected him, if they had known him, or thought him Genuine? Can we think the *Phœnicians* would have valued him, if his own *Country-men* had so neglected him?

§. XXIII. Certainly, if he ever had any such *Memoires*, or made use of them any where, it must have been, most probably, where, he gives account of *Jewish* matters. But his accounts concerning them, are so full of *mistakes*, of mistakes so inconsistent even with *Jewish* Interest, as could not, with any probability, have been occasioned by any *Jewish* Testimonies; much less by so grave an unexceptionable a Testimony as that of *Gideon*. I have had occasion to mention one instance already, that of his making *Gideon* a *Priest*. And such generally are the rest of his accounts of *Jewish* affairs, as far as we can judge of them, by the few Fragments preserved to us by *Porphyry*. He makes *Abraham* a Native *Phœnician*, and the same with the *Greek* Saturn, who bestowed *Attica* on *Minerva*. What *Jew* would have rob'd his Nation of their *Father Abraham* they so much boasted of, would have derived them from the *Uncir-*

By the Name of *Saturn* ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. P. 36. C. P. 38. D.

cumcised

cumcis'd Philistines, so much abhorred and despised by them? Would have dishonoured *Abraham* himself, so far as to have made him a *Heathen Deity*, a thing so detested by the *Jews*? He makes him *actually* Sacrifice his Son. It is plain what Interest obliged him to say so, *viz.* that he might hereby give an account of that Antient, but Inhuman Custom, of *Sacrificing* their own Children to him, under the name of *Saturn* or *Moloch*. For this was generally the design of the *Heathen Mysteries*, to commemorate some memorable Action of their *Deity*. Thus the pleasure that *Ceres* took in the obscene behaviour of *Baubo*, was commemorated in the *Eleusinian Mysteries*. And the like delight that *Hercules* took in the *Plow-man's Curses*, when he was eating his Plow-Oxen, was also remembred with the like *Curses* still repeated in the Solemnities of the Worship of *Hercules*. But what ground could he have in doing so, from the *Old Testament*? He might indeed from the later *Mystical* Expositions of the *Hellenists*, who speak of it as done, because it was reckoned to him as done in the *Divine acceptance*, *Gen.* xxii. 16. Therefore St. *Paul* says he *Offered him*, *Heb.* xi. 17. adding withal, that he *received*

ived him from Death in a Figure, v. 19. And the expression of having actually *offered him*, is also used by St. *Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. If it were hence that he derived his mistake, that will also prove him Counterfeited about the time he was first produced. He gives also different accounts of the reason why *Abraham* should have offered his Son. Sometimes, κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειλημμένον τὴν χώραν sometimes again, λοιμῷ γενομένου ἐν ὁδοῖς. I know not whether any occasion of the former account, might have been taken from 2 *Kings* iii. 27. *Am.* i. 16. where the King of *Moab* being pressed by distress of *War*, offer'd a *First-born* Son; but not his own, but the King of *Edoms*. But there is no pretence of either in *Abraham*'s case from any *Jewish* Records, nor consequently could he have these different Informations from the *Memoires* of *Gideon*, unless we can suppose them, not only different from all the Authentick Records of his *Nation*, but from themselves also, these things being the Principal in this Author, that concern the *Jews*, and yet, being so impossible to have been taken from any *Memoires* of *Gideon*, make me verily suspect, that the Forger of this Author himself, as he did not

Clem. ad Corinth. Ep. 1. §. 10.

P. 40. D.

P. 38. D.

not *use*, so neither did he know of any such *Memoires*, either truly or pretendedly passing under the Name of *Gideon*, at least, not owned for such among the *Jews*. Which as it is a clear conviction of his designed disingenuity in a matter not excusable by any pretence of Ignorance; so it will render him justly liable to a suspicion of a like disingenuity in his other fair pretences, though we had not the like evidence of conviction of them. At least no such pretences to means of Information must be trusted on his *word*, and there is no better pretended for them.

§. XXIV. BUT, to let the Informations alone, the work it self affords Intrinsick Arguments enough of just suspition. A great occasion of the *Forgeries* of those times, was the *Emulation* of several Nations, for glory of Inventions and Antiquity. Hence it came to pass, that of all glorious Inventions, and of all Famous Persons, so very different and inconsistent accounts are given by the *Historians* of the several Rival Nations, each of them challenging them for their own. Hence such a multitude of *Jupiters*, *Hercules*'s *Æsculapius*'s, *Diana*'s, &c. nay, and of *Homers* too, different not only in Nation,

on, but in Age too, yet pretending generally to the glory of the ſame Actions. It muſt needs be, that of ſo inconſiſtent reports concerning the ſame Perſon, all but one muſt have been not miſtakes, but deſigned *Forgeries*. Which I therefore note to ſhew that, as it was not unuſual, ſo neither was it new, to *Forge* on ſuch occaſions. Yet they pretended generally to honeſt means of Information. Now this pretended *Sanchoniathon*, is full of this vanity of arrogating uſeful Inventions and Perſons to his own *Phœnicia*. Which, as they will prove him *later* than theſe *Æmulations* of ſeveral Nations about Antiquity, much later than the time pretended for the true *Sanchoniathon*; ſo they will expoſe him to all the *Teſtimonies* and *Arguments* that may be produced for the ſeveral Nations againſt him in *all*, or *any* of the reſpective Particulars. If he can be diſproved or charged with indirect dealing in any one particular, that will be ſufficient to weaken his credit in all the reſt. Let us come therefore to the particulars.

XXV. THUS he aſcribes the Invention of Iron, to the *Phœnician* Χρυσὼρ, in all likelihood, the ſame with Χρυσάωρ in *Heſiod*, whom he makes the Famous *Vulcan*; where- Ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 35. C.

as

Hesiod. Theolog. 281. 287. as the *Scripture* attributes the same t *Tubal Cain*, and the *Græcians*, to the *Id Dactyli*, not long before the Wars o *Troy*. For *there* we find that all the *Arm* of the *Heroes*, both *offensive* and *defensive* were of *Brass*, as appears by *Homer*, an is observed by the *Scholiast*, on *Apollon us Rhodius* and *Pausanias*, which ar great suspicions that the Invention of *Iro* was late, because it had not as yet reache those Parts. But it is indeed strange, tha *Vulcan* should here be taken for a *Phœni cian*, who is by the *Ægyptians*, reporte to have been the notorious Original o the first Generation of their *Deifie Kings*; The design of which *Deifyin* being observed by this *Philo* himself, t have been the honour of some profitabl Invention for Human Life, will make i likewise probable, that he was also taken for the *Inventor* of *Fire* and *Iron*. Ther were indeed several *Vulcans* observed b the *Antients*, but not above *Four*, an among them none that appears to have been thought *Phœnician*. Thus also he makes *Magus* the Son of the Αλῆ and *Titanes*, which were accounted bad *Dæ mons*. Who sees not here an instance o that ordinary vanity of the *Græcians*, o turning the *Name* of the *Sect* into a pro per

Cl. Al. Str. 1. In *Apoll.* Argonnut. L. 1. v. 430. 1196. *Pausan.* Laconic. p. 84.

Herodot. *Euseb.* Græc. *Manetho* p. 6. 7. *Ammian Mercellin.* in Inscrip. in L. xvii. Apud *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. D. *Cicer.* de Nat. Deor. L. III. *Cl. Alex.* Prot. *Arnob.* L. 4. Ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 35. D.

per Name of a *Man*, and thence pretending to give an account of their first Institution? Who sees not a plain design to rob the *Chaldæans* of the *Magi*, and to make them a *Phœnician* Invention? Which let him believe, who can find in his heart to do so. I need not to observe, that the whole Sect of the *Magi*, if they were first instituted by the *Chaldæan Zoroastres*, (who seems to have lived near the time of *Pythagoras*, and is said by some to have conversed with him) they must have been Instituted long after the time of our pretended *Sanchoniathon*, and therefore could not have been taken notice of by him. As for the *Bactrian Zoroastres*, I doubt the very pretending to him was only such another design of robbing the *Chaldæans* of him. *Diodorus* calls him *Oxyartes*, and that was, it may be, his true Name. I might also observe, that when he makes this *Magus* the Son of those *bad Dæmons*, he evidently alludes to the *bad sense* of the Name of *Magus*, which was yet very much later than the Institution of the *Sect* it self. L. 11. Bibl. ex *Ctesia*.

§. XXVI. HE also makes the *Dioscuri*, not only *Phœnicians*, but the same also with the *Corybantes* and *Curetes*. It is evident he could not understand the Ap. *Euseb.* ib. p. 36. *A*.

Castores,

Castores, who were not only *later* than *Sanchoniathon*, but than those *Curetes* and *Corybantes* also. The most candid sense that can be put upon it, is by the name *Dioscuri* to understand, not the *Sons*, but the *Nurses* of *Jupiter*. So indeed the word κυείζειν is used in *Hesiod* for *Nursing*. And so the *Curetes* or *Corybantes*, are in Truth, said to have *Nursed* him in the *Antrum Idæum*. But then, the word being *Greek*, could not have been known to the *Phœnician Sanchoniathon*; and what word must have answered it in his Original *Phœnician*, is not easie to guess. Nor do I know why *Philo* should use it in so unusual a Notion, which yet he elsewhere uses for them absolutely, without the explicatory Addition of the Titles of *Curetes* or *Corybantes*. And is not this a plain design upon the *Cretan Jupiter*, to make him, as well as his *Nurses* Originally *Phœnician*? But this may possibly be thought excusable as an *Interpolation* of the *Translator*, who must at least, have been the Author of that *Greek* word. For it seems evident, not only from this, but the mention of several other *Greek* words, and of the *Greek* Nation, nay, of the very *Alexandrians*, that he did

Theog. v. 347.

Ap. Euseb. lib. p. 37.

Greek words, Δαγὼν ὡς ὃς Σίτων, p. 36. because Ζεὺς ἀεὶ τεθ, p. 27. Οὐρανὸς, Κρόνθ, Ἑρμῆς, &c. &c. p. 39. where he quotes *Hesiod*, &c.

did use the liberty, rather of a *Paraphrast*, than of a faithful accurate *Translator*. But then, how shall we be able to distinguish between his *Interpolations*, and the *Text* of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. It seems also strange, that these *Corybantes* or *Cabiri*, or *Samothraces*, which, by the *Græcians* account of them, seem to have been the same, and to have accompanied the *Mater Deorum* out of *Phrygia* into *Crete*, should here be made immediately *Phœnicians*, though I am apt to believe indeed that their *Mysteries* had some *Originally-Phœnician* Ingredients. But it is yet more strange, how they should have found *Crete* inhabited, where they must have *Nursed*, or at least, *received Jupiter*, if themselves had been the first *Inventors of Ships*, as is here pretended, unless possibly they made use of those hard shifts, which are here also mentioned, as invented before. Which yet is hardly credible of so great a *Multitude* as might be thought sufficient to People the whole Island.

Bochart. de *Phœn.* Colon. 1.12.

Ib. p. 36. A.

§. XXVII. Other instances there are of the like *Vanity* and *Affectation* in this Author. Some I have had occasion to touch at formerly. Who can endure to see (1) *Abraham*, to see the famous *Ægyptian*

(1) Ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 38. D. & p. 40. C.

(2) *Ib.* p. 36. A. p. 39. B. *an* (2) *Hermes*, made Original *Phœnic ans*? This alone, one would think, we sufficient to overthrow those great El gies that are given him for his *Fait fulness* and *Diligence*, but this is not al *Jupiter Belus*, the famous Founder the *Assyrian* Monarchy, *Typhon* the Bro ther of the famous *Ægyptian Osiri* must also be made Originally *Phœnic ans*; than which what can be more *cer tainly false*, if any thing be *certain* in th Antient *Assyrian* or *Ægyptian Histories* So must also *Adodus* the Father of *Ben hadad* King of *Syria* in the *Scripture*, an in *Trogus Pompeius*, and worshipped b the *Syrians* for a *God*. So must *Æsc lapius*, whose Sons were *Peloponnesian* and on that account present at the Wa of *Troy*; besides that himself is reporte to have been the Son of *Arsinoe* th Daughter of *Leucippus* a *Messenian*. S must also *Minerva*, if she had *Attica* be stowed on her by the *Phœnician Saturn* But when were the *Phœnicians* so famou for their Conquests, as to have so grea and remote Dominions as *Ægypt*, *Assyri* and *Attica* at their disposal? What wri ter, even of their own, however partia to his own Country, did so much as pre tend it before our pretended *Sanchonia*

Ib. p. 38. A. *Ib.* D.

Messenians. Pausan. in *Messen.* p. 113. *Corin.* p. 68. & alibi.

thon

thon? But it is a ſtrange miſtake in *Chronology* (in which it ſeems to have been a ſpecial Providence of God for their Diſcovery, that *Counterfeiters* have generally been unskillful) that ſhe ſhould be made *contemporary*, or rather *later* (*) than *Æſculapius*, as will appear by our Authors computation; whereas *Æſculapius* flouriſhed, as I ſaid before, but little before the War of *Troy*, but *Minerva* ſtrove with *Neptune*, for the Dominion of *Attica* in the time of *Cecrops Diphyes*, ſome hundreds of Years before. There were indeed ſeveral *Minervæ* and *Æſculapii* pretended by them, who had the curioſity to enquire into them, in order to the expoſing them. But this very pretence of a *Multitude*, was later than the times of *Æmulation*, and yet none of thoſe Multitudes pretended to have been *Phœnicians*. The paſſage of *Damaſcius* concerning a *Phœnician Æſculapius*, ſeems plainly tranſcribed from *Philo Byblius*, and therefore ought not to be taken for a diſtinct Authority.

(*) For ſhe is made the Daughter of *Saturn*, p. 36. D. But *Eſculapius* is made the Son of *Syduc*, the Brother of *Miſor*, whoſe Son *Mercury* is ſaid to have been Counſellor to *Saturn* as ſoon as he was come to Man's Eſtate, p. 36. D. And the *Poſterity* of the *Dioſcuri* are made contemporary with *Saturn*, p. 37.B. Which *Dioſcuri* themſelves were Sons of *Syduc*, and conſequently *Brethren* to *Æſculapius*. See p. 36. A.

Damaſ. vit. *Iſidor.* ap. *Phot.* Cod. cexlii. p. 1073.

Ib. p. 38. D.

§. XXVIII. AND why ſhould *Abraham*, if he were the *Phœnician Saturn*, *Circumciſe* himſelf, as this Author alſo pretends, when it is ſo well known, that the Antient *Phœnicians* were ſo averſe to it, that a long time after *Abraham*'s death, they are ſtill ſtigmatized by the name of the *uncircumciſed Philiſtines*? But the deſign is plain. He had a mind to challenge a Perſon of ſuch Note for his Country-man; and becauſe the Story of *Abraham*'s making a Covenant with God by *Circumciſion*, was one of the moſt memorable paſſages of that Great Man's Life, therefore he thought it fit to aſſert it to their *Saturn*. And it may be the rather, becauſe by this time, when this work was Counterfeited, the *Phœnicians* themſelves ſeem alſo to have received *Circumciſion* from the *Ægyptians*. Who knows but that ſuch Tales as theſe might have been the reaſon why *Abraham* was worſhipped at *Mamre*, for ſome conſiderable time before *Conſtantine* who firſt forbad it, with *Idols* and *Sacrifices*; by *Gentiles* as well as *Chriſtians*; by *Phœnicians* as well as thoſe of *Palæſtine* and *Arabia*? That *Human Sacrifices* were not among thoſe as they are particularized by *Sozomen* (though they were otherwiſe the pro-

Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. III. 53. *Sozomen.* Eccl. Hiſt. II. 4.

pereſ

rest for the *Phœnician Saturn*) there was very good reason, because they had been, long before that time, forbidden by *Roman Laws*. The First *Roman Law* against them was at *Rome*, *An.* 21. C. 657. *L. Cornelius Lentulus* and *P. Licinius Crassus* being (1) *Consuls*. After that it was particularly forbidden the *Druids* by (2) *Tiberius*, at last forbidden every where by the Emperor (3) *Hadrian*. Besides that by the account *Philo Biblyus* himself, as well as other Writers of *Phoenician* Affairs, give concerning them; these *human Sacrifices*, by the Rules of the *Phoenicians* themselves, seem not to have been ordinary, but only reserved for some very great *distress*, as an *expiation* to that *angry Dæmon*. But all these instances do abundantly shew how extreamly partial this Author was, in adorning his own Nation with the spoils of others. Which is not reconcileable either with the *Veracity* or *Antiquity* of the true *Sanchoniathon*. Nor will any supposable mistakes of *Philo* in *translating* him, serve to bring him off in so gross and designed instances concerning his *Neighbours* and the *Famous Persons* now mentioned. For they concern *Things*, not *Words* and *Expressions*; Things very notorious, not

(1 2) *Plin.* Nat. Hist. xxx. c. 1.

(3) *Porphy.* de Abst. 11. 56.

only of *Probable* or *Conjectural* Evidence.

§. XXIX. I cannot therefore but think this Author Counterfeited purposely with a design of confronting the *Antiquity* of the *Scripture*. But who was the *Impostor*, whether *Philo Byblius* or *Porphyry*, that I confess I cannot easily determine. I confess I should rather charge it on *Porphyry*, the abusing of the Name of *Philo*, as well as that of *Sanchoniathon*, were it not for that only Testimony of *Athenæus*, and I have given my reasons why I should otherwise have thought it improbable that *Philo* was the Author of that *Translation*. But because I cannot tell what to say to that express Quotation of *Athenæus* before the time of *Porphyry*, I doubt *Philo* will not easily be discharged of it. For by his Exceptions against the Testimony of *Hecatæus* for what he had Written in *favour* of the *Jews*, That either his work must have been counterfeited; or if genuine, that he himself must have been carried away by the *plausibility* of the *Jewish pretences*: It appears that he was engaged in that Dispute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, and engaged *against* the *Jews*, and therefore was a Person sufficiently interessed to set on such a disingenuous

Συνηγορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ (τοῦ) τοῦ Ἑβραίοις πιστεύειν Philo ap. Orig. cont. Cels. l. p. 13.

nous design as far as his *Principles* uld give him leave. And I have al-dy shewn how far *Platonical Principles* l so. If I may venture to guess in a tter that affords no better Arguments n *guesses*, I should suspect that *Jose-*'s Books against *Appion* were the oc-sion of engaging *Philo* on this Subject. hat *Josephus* had there produced in de-nce of the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, was y probably the πιθανότης alluded to by *ilo*. I cannot think any other was ant, because *Josephus* seems to have en the *first* that engaged in that Dis-te (he does not intimate in the least t any had engaged in it before him) d because the time was so short between *sephus* and *Philo*, that there could hard-be any new occasion for any one else undertake that cause that *Josephus* had very lately, and so accurately defend-d. For *Josephus* wrote his Books against *pion* immediately after his *Antiquities* d his *Life*, in the Thirteenth Year of *omitian*, because he dedicated these also the same *Epaphroditus*, who was put to ath in the Year following; and *Philo* ems to have written under *Hadrian*. sides the fame of *Josephus*, with all well-shers to Learning, and the Eminent ca-

pacities he ſerved in, both among his own *Country-men*, and in the Courts of the *Veſpaſians*, added no doubt a greater Authority to what came from him, and recommended it to the Reading of all curious Perſons, not now to mention the Atteſtations of the *Emperors*, and of King *Agrippa*, and of other Learned Men, *Heathens* as well as others, among whom himſelf reckons *Julius Archelaus* and *Herod*. And this very Teſtimony of *Hecataeus*, which it ſeems ſo gravelled *Philo*, had been produced, and inſiſted on, in this very work by *Joſephus*. Which will therefore make it very probable, that this Work of *Philo Byblius* againſt the *Jews*, was deſigned in anſwer to *Joſephus* againſt *Appion*.

C. *App.* 1. 1037. F.

Cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1048. B. 11. p. 1063. F.

§. XXX. WHICH being ſuppoſed, I conſider further that *Joſephus* in that ſame Work had principally inſiſted on the Teſtimonies of *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, for proving the *Antiquity* of his own *Nation*, as of thoſe who had beſt reaſon to know them; but the *Phoenicians* moſt of all, as being neareſt. Accordingly he Appeals not only to their *Writers* that were extant, but their written *Records*, their Αναγραφαι, which were preſerved to that very time. This could not chooſe but

Cont. *App.* L. 1. p. 1039. C.

C. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1043. E. *Antiq.* viii. 2. p. 258. F. C. *Appion.* 1. p. 1042. B.

ut particularly move *Philo Byblius* as ing himself a *Phœnician*, and who might ery well have known *Josephus* himself, he were Threescore and Eighteen years ld, at the Two hundred and twentieth *lympiad*, as has been observed out of *Suida*, though possibly the *odd* Number of he *Olympiad*, above Two hundred and wenty, which is requisite to make him ive to Write concerning the Empire of *Hadrian*, is wanting. I mention not *Scaiger*'s Ἀναγραφὴ which tells us more particularly, not the *Olympiad* only, but also he very year wherein he conceives him o have Written, because it is of no Authority. But there was another thing that added further to the reputation of the *Jews* about that time. Their *Essenes* had been in great reputation with as many as had occasion to hear of them, as a very *Philosophical* sort of Persons. *Pliny* the Elder had mentioned them with great respect, as afterwards *Porphyry* did also. But this concerned only their *Philosophy* of living. There were also among them, others who had written *Books* of *Philosophy*, not only *Aristobulus* the *Peripatetick* in the time of *Ptolomæus Philometor*; not only many others intimated, though not named by *Philo* the *Jew*, and *Josephus*, if

Nat. Hist. v. 17. de Abstin. iv. §. 11, &c.

if he ever lived to finish that work of the Sentiments of the *Jews*, so often promised by him, as I doubt, he did not. These, by Mysticizing the Κοσμογενία of *Moses* to a sense, not very distant from that received among the wisest *Philosophers*, and in a most elegant, rapturous, modish stile (such was that of *Philo* particularly.) They gained so much further on the good opinion of the wise ones of that Age, as to have their Nation, which had formerly been despised as *Barbarous*, now to pass among the Nations which were Famous for Wisdom. And the rather because this way of *Mysticizing* the *Poets*, for the *Greeks*, into a *Systeme* of *Philosophy*, was already taken up by the *Stoicks*, and the other *Dogmatical Philosophers*, who were concerned for the defence of the received *Religions* against the *Atheists* and *Epicuræans*, and *Scepticks*, who had taken great advantage from those *Fables*, for exposing them. Who had withal, been herein imitated by the *Ægyptians*, who had *Allegorized Isis* and *Osiris*, and all their own most Antient Histories. From whom the *Alexandrian Jews* seem willing to differ as little as was possible. Accordingly *Laertius*, who wrote not long after, takes them into that Number; and

Præf. ad Antiq. in fin. & Ant. xx. 9. & alibi sæpe.

Procem. ad vit. Philos. p. 3 B.

d endeavoured, as he was able, to give me account of them, though on the ill formations of *Clearchus* the *Peripatick*. So also *Numenius* before him. *Numen.* ap. *Orig.* c. *Cels.* 1. p. 13. & *Eu.* Pr. Ev. ix. 7.

§ XXXI. BUT there were also other things that contributed hereunto about the time of which I am speaking. One was the attestation of some *Oracles* received among the *Heathens* themselves, which also commended them for that very cause wherein they differed from the rest of Mankind. Such was that produced by St. *Justin Martyr*, not long after the time of *Philo*, as given by a *Heathen Deity* to a *Heathen Enquirer*: So he, Ἐφημένα γάρ τινα (ὡς αὐτοί φατε) τὸ παρ' ὑμῖν χρηστήριον, τινὰς συνέβη ἀποστρέψαι ἀνδρὰς γεγενῆσθαί ποτε, ὅπου τὸ χρηστήριον ἐρημῶσαι φατέ. Parnætic. p. 12.

Μόνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον ἠδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι
Ἀυτογένητον Ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν αὐτόν.

God might possibly in this Case, make the *Devil* speak against his own Interest, as he did in the case of *Balaam*. To the same purpose we have other *Oracles* also owned by *Porphyry* (very probably in his Body of *Philosophy. Collected out of Oracles*,) whereof some might have been Antienter than the time of *Philo Byblius*. Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. x. 10. I am not concerned to Dispute what *real* Credit these *Oracles* deserved, yet certainly

tainly they could not choose but have been very powerful recommendations to those *Philosophers* who did actually believe them *Divine*, and that is all for which I am concerned at present. To the same purpose, also I refer the advantageous Characters of *Abraham* and *Moses*, in the *Orphaicks* first mentioned in these first times of *Christianity*. And as *Orpheus* had among the *Heathens* the Reputation of a *Sacred* and *Inspired Person*, so his word must have been reverenced by them all, but particularly by the *Ægyptians*, and the Disciples of *Mercury*, because he was taken for a great promoter of their *Philosophy*. But there was yet a further reason that might peculiarly recommend him to the *Ægyptians*. That is, that he was, by some Traditions, received by Persons of great Authority among themselves, pretended to have been a *Sacred Person* to the Deity of *Heliopolis*. So *Chæremon*, a Ἱερογραμματεὺς himself, makes *Joseph* and *Moses* also to have been *Ægyptian* Ἱερογραμματεῖς, in the same Notion as the *Jew*, also had their *Sacred Scribes*. And *Manetho* a *High Priest* and *Scribe*, also had delivered the the same concerning *Moses*, that his *Ægyptian* name was *Osarsyph*, and that he was called so from *Osiris*. So I read

Ap. *Joseph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B. *Manetho* ap. *Joseph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1053. A. & 1054. A. 1055. C.

Ὀσίρεως

Ὀνίφεως rather than Θείωνος the God of *Heliopolis* to whom he was *Priest*. The occasion of pretending this concerning *Joseph*, might possibly be his Marrying the Daughter of *Potipherah* Priest of *On*, which by the *Greek* Interpreters and *Demetrius*, was rendred Ἡλιόπολις. Concerning *Moses*, possibly it was his skill in all the *Learning of the Ægyptians*, that which was (1) *Sacred* as well as other sorts, which they might think he could never have got in such Perfection, if himself had not been a *Sacred Person*. It is no matter how far they were mistaken in believing so concerning him. Their actual believing so, is sufficient for my purpose, to make them entertain a great reverence for his *Philosophy*.

Demetrius ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 21.

(1) *Philo. Jud.* de. vit. *Mos.* Lib. 1. p. 66 6. B. *Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C. D.

§. XXXII. ACCORDINGLY there was about that time a Sect of the *Philosophers* themselves, that began to take notice of those *Mystical* Expositions of the *Law*, and to produce them with respect as *Authorities*, with honourable mention of *Moses* under the Titles of *Legislator* and *Prophet*. A name not unusual to them among the other *Orientals* that were Famous for Wisdom, but particularly used among the *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, and very properly belonging to him

as

L. III. adv. *Christian.* ap. *Euseb.* Eccl. Hist. vi. 19.

as a *Scribe* or *Priest* of *Heliopolis*. *Porphy* that inveterate Enemy of *Christiani* takes notice of them, as they who had l our *Christian Origen* the way in his *Alleg rical Expositions*. For such he reckon *Numenius*, *Cronius*, *Apollophanes*, *Long nus*, *Moderatus*, *Nicomachus*, *Chærem* and *Cornutus*. These did not only fo low the way of *Allegorizing*, in turnin the *Heathen Theogonies* into *Mystic* Senses, as appears in the work still e tant of *Cornutus*, on that Subject. Th was not new. The *Stoicks* whom bo *Cornutus* and *Chæremon* followed, ha begun that long before. They also fo lowed the *Allegorizing Jews*, in allowin the Authority of *Moses*, in quoting hi by the name of ὁ Προφήτης only, which think is not usual with any but those *Al gorical Writers*. Thus *Numenius*, wit whom it was very ordinary. Thus *Lo ginus* in that only work which is extan of his, Περὶ Τέλους. And no doubt it woul have appeared concerning more of the if they had been extant. Nay thus eve afterwards (when the rancours of th *Philosophers* themselves against the Scr ptures were grown higher) *Porphy* himself, and *Chalcidius*, who is therefo by some less considering Persons mistake fo

Orig. c. Cels. i. p. 13. iv. p. 198, 199.

De antr. Nymph. p. 256.

for a *Christian*, who yet presumes to confute (*) his *Prophet* where he dissents from him, though he do it indeed, as became the time he lived in, when the Empire was *Christian*, with civility and great respect. And the first of these which are mentioned by *Porphyry* will, in all likelihood, be earlier than *Philo Byblius*. So will *Apollophanes*, if he were the same who was meant by the Counterfeiter of the Works now extant under the name of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, who is there made to observe the *Eclipse* at our *Saviours* Death at *Heliopolis* in *Ægypt*; and if that otherwise Learned Impostor have but observed the due *decorum* of time. Much more, if he were the *Stoick*, mentioned by *Athenæus*, but under the corrupt name of *Aphanes*, as contemporary with *Eratosthenes*, and Fellow-Disciple with him to *Ariston Chius*. And some of his Companions in this passage of *Porphyry* were *Stoicks*, as *Cornutus* and *Cheremon*. So will *Numenius*, if it were to him that *Apollonius Tyanæus* wrote that Discourse, whereof we have a Fragment in *Stobæus*. So will also *Cronius* for the same

(*) He reckons *Moses* among those who make *matter* to have a beginning. p. 372. *Edit. Meursii*. But he afterwards joyns himself with those who make it *Eternal* p. 376. 401. 409. 410, &c. Besides his saying concerning *Moses*, *divina, ut ferunt, Inspiratione vegetatus*, plainly implies, that he did not believe him so inspired himself, but that he only delivered herein the Sense of *others*.

Athen. Deipnos. vii. 6. vid. *Menag.* in *Laert.* L. vii. p. 186.

Eclog. Physic.

De Antr. Nymph. p. 263.

same reason, whom *Porphyrius* assures to have been Ἑταῖρος, a Friend and acquaintance of *Numenius*. So was *Annæus Cornutus* certainly, and *Chæremon* the *Stoick*, contemporary with *Martial* under *Domitian*, who must yet have been o at that time, if it were his Book *de Comet* which was mentioned by *Seneca*. And he certainly quoted by *Josephus*.

To him *Persius* writes Sat. V. Lib. xi. Ep. 58.

Nat. Quæst. L. vii. c. 5.

confr. *Orig. c. Cels.* l. p. 45.

§. XXXIII. BUT there was also anoth occasion about this time, which made th *Jewish* Κοσμογενία more taken notice o Which, though it seems indeed to ha proceeded from this, yet recommende it farther, to many who knew nothing the favourable esteem the formention *Philosophers* had for the *Jewish Philosop* it self. That is, that it was about th time, taken into the pretended *Philosop* of the *Ægyptian Hermes*. The name *Hermes* had indeed been mentioned many Authors before the coming of o Saviour. His *Pillars* also are said to ha been consulted by *Manetho* for compili his *History*. But for any *Philosophi Discourses* published under his name, su as the *Pœmander* and *Asclepius* now e tant, such as were many more now lo but mentioned by the *Antients*, I belie there can be no Testimonies produc mu

In *Euseb. Græ.* p. 6.

much Antienter than *Philo Byblius*, at least not as extant in the common *Greek Character* as well as *Tongue*. And yet they could hardly have been much *later*, considering that St. *Justin Martyr* quotes them about the time of *Antoninus Pius*, as also his Contemporary *Apuleius*, if the *Latin* Translation of *Asclepius* be his, considering withal, that (1) *Plutarch* also mentions them, an Author undoubtedly equal, if not Antienter than *Philo Byblius*; that (2) *Ælian* does so who lived under *Hadrian*, Contemporary with *Philo*; considering also that before them, the *Ægyptian Hereticks*, the *Basilidians* especially, and the *Valentinians*, made use of many of his Notions. Now those *Hereticks* are generally by the consent of *Antiquity*, said to have risen about the time of *Hadrian*. But our most Learned Bishop of *Chester* * thinks them Antienter, to whom I refer the Reader for satisfaction that desires it. However, the Author from whom they borrowed their *Heresies*, should in all reason, be some while Antienter than they. And

(1) De Isid. & Osirid. Ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ λεγομέναις βίβλοις ἱερεῖσι γεγράφθαι, &c. p. 375. F.

(2) He quotes ὑπόμνημα τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τῷ περισβυτάτῳ concerning the Marks of *Apis*, probably out of those Two and Forty *Mystical Books* of *Hermes*, which contained the *Rituals* of the *Ægyptian Priests*, mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, unless possibly he did not mean a *Book*, but a *Tradition* Fathered upon *Hermes*, like those mentioned by *Manetho*.

* Vind. *Ign.*

from him it is most likely that the *Valentinians* took their *Ogdoas*, and the *Basilidians* their *Magical* Practices, that I may not now descend to a more particular Parallel. Nor yet can I think, as the Learned *Casaubon* does, that any *Christian* (even of those *Hereticks*) counterfeited him. There are such other marks in him, that the Author was indeed a *Heathen*. He calls the *Sun the greatest God of those that are in Heaven, to whom all the Heavenly Gods pay respect, as to their King and Potentate*. And he elsewhere mentions the *God's appearing in the Stars*. That he should call the *Sun God*, might indeed seem agreeable to the *Basilidian Hypothesis*, who made *Abraxas* theirs. But that he should allow all the *Stars* for *Gods* also, seems more than any *Christian* could grant. Yet even this Expression the *Hellenistical Jews* did not scruple. So *Philo* the *Jew*, speaking concerning the Creation of the *Heavens*, says, that it ought therefore to be created first, and of the purest part of *Matter*, Διόπ θεῶν ἀφανῶν τε καὶ ἀιδίων ἔμελλεν οἶκος ἔσεσθαι ἱερώτατος. These Ἀιδίοι θεοὶ were no doubt the *Stars*. However there were many more things extant then, in the time of *Philo Byblius*, which did undeniably

Pæmand. c. 3. 25.

Ib. c. 3. 17.

De Mund. Opif. p. 5. E.

bly prove the Author to have been a *Heathen.* Such were those Books mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, wherein all the whole Order of the *Ægiptian* Worship was particularly prescribed, by which their Idolatrous *Priests* in those times were guided. Strom. vi. p. 633.

§. XXXIV. YET though the Author of these Counterfeited Works, pretending to the name of *Hermes* were a *Heathen*, I must withal grant, that the great Person now mentioned, had an occasion for mistaking him for a *Christian*, from those frequent allusions to the *Old Testament* Scriptures, which he had observed in him. But I have already shewn another way how these *Allusions*, not express *Quotations*, might have been used by a *Heathen* of that Age. That is, that the Counterfeiter of them, might have been one of that Sect of *Philosophers*, who had, as has been shewn, taken in the *Jewish Philosophy* into theirs, from the Writings of *Philo* and such others as had recommended it to them, by their *Mystical Expositions* of it. Accordingly, their Quotations of the *Scriptures* themselves, are generally at the *Second hand*, as they found them already produced by such Writers as they dealt with, not mentioning, or

but very rarely, either *Book* or *Author*, as in all likelyhood they would, if they had taken them immediately from the *Originals*. And this Party was more likely to propagate among the *Ægyptians* (such as these undoubtedly were who Forged the Works of *Hermes*) because the *Alexandrian Jews* were most Famous both for *Numbers* and *Learning*, above any of their Nation in any other Colony; had multitudes of their *Philosophical Essenes*, and a flourishing *Temple* among them to the days of *Vespasian*; and did, no doubt, suit their Notions as near, as Truth would give them leave, to the *received* Doctrines of the *Ægyptians*, which were very plausible recommendations to them. And when it had thus got into the *Hermetical Philosophy*, by this means it was unawares insinuated into those who were most averse either to the *Jewish* or the *Christian* Religion, who yet had a great Veneration for the *Philosophy*, as was pretended, of the Antient and Deified *Hermes*. *Longinus* was one of them, who yet wrote against the *Christians*. And *Porphyry* another, who yet was one of the greatest Adversaries, perhaps, that the *Christians* ever had. And this was the more likely to prevail among them, when

Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. xv. 20.

when *Moses* himself was taken for one of their own *Priests*, and that of *Heliopolis*, where those very *Pillars* are pretended to have been, from whence the Doctrine of *Mercury* was pretended to have been Collected, the custody of which must, by their Customs, been properly his Province as a *Priest*. So that on this account, they might presume his Doctrine to have been the same with that of *Mercury*. But how much more might they presume it, if they took his Person to have been the same also? And some of them were of that Opinion, if we may believe *Artapanus*. This I take to be a more likely account, how *Scripture Notions* got among the *Philosophers*, than the common mistaken passage concerning *Ammonius* and the περὶ διαδοχῶν. I am sure it agrees much better both with *Historical* Truth and *Experiments* than the other, however it has had the Fortune to take among Learned Men.

Artap. apud *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27.

§. XXXV. To return therefore to *Philo Byblius*, this I take to be the most likely design of his forging the whole History of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. He was, no doubt, as a *Phœnician*, zealously concerned for the honour of his Country. Nay his concernment for his own City

Ἐπὶ τέλοις ὁ Κρόνος τε καὶ περιβάλλει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ οἰκήσει, καὶ πρώτην πόλιν κτίζει τὴν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης Βύβλον. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 37. A. and from him *Stephanus.* Nat. Hist. v. 20.

Byblos appears, in that he makes his fictitious Author pretend that it was the *First City* in *Phœnicia.* Had it been so, it is strange, it should never have been mentioned in the *Scriptures* before the times of the Prophets, where notwithstanding so many other *Phœnician* Cities are so frequently mentioned. The גבל in *Josua* seems to be rather from *Gabala* a City of *Phœnicia*, distinct from *Byblios*, in *Ptolomy* and *Gamala* in *Pliny.* This very thing is a shrewd suspicion that *Sanchoniathon* was to say nothing but what *Philo Byblius* would have him, that though we have seen him so full of a partial *design* for the Honour of his Country; and though we have seen him guilty of so many *instances* of notorious *disingenuity* in that regard; and though this pretence concerning *Byblos*, appears, from the *Scripture*-description of *Phœnicia*, to have been as groundless a *fiction* as any he had been guilty of: Yet he should yield to the Interest of *Philo*, and make his *Byblos* a more Antient City even than his own beloved *Berytus*, when he might with as much ground have preferred his own City before it. The name of *Berytus* does certainly better resemble a *Phœnician* Original than that of *Byblos.* *Philo* therefore being

being thus concerned; and being, by his concerniment, prompted to say many things both new and false, and which could not be made appear from any Monuments as yet produced; thought himself therefore obliged to pretend some new means of *Information* for his pretended *Sanchoniathon*, in such matters as he was to deliver without any known Authority of *extant* Authors. And because he knew the *Tyrian Records* and *Inscriptions* had been searched and published before; he therefore makes his *Sanchoniathon* to enquire also into the *Records* and *Inscriptions* of the other *particular Cities*. This seems to have been his Artifice to reccommend what he had to say in favour of his own City, in opposition to the other Cities of *Phœnicia*, or in favour of his Country, in opposition to such Countries as had not Authority of their own *Records* to oppose against him.

Ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων, &c. *Porphyr.* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 31. B.

§. XXXVI. BUT these were not the only Adversaries against whom his Ambition had engaged him in this Work. He seems also in this very Work to have had a particular design upon the *Jews*. One whole *Book* of this work seems to have related to them in particular. For that very same passage concerning *Abraham*'s

Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 40. B. Sacrificing *Isaac*, which *Eusebius* relates from the work of *Philo* Περὶ Ἰουδαίων that
Pr. Ev. iv. 16. p. 156. D. he produces elsewhere from the *First Book* of his *Phœnician* History. By this it should seem, both that the *proper Title* of the *First Book* was concerning the *Jews* (as many (*) Instances might have been given of such proper *Titles* of *Parts* of *larger Works* in those times) and that this *Book* distinct from *Philo*'s Preface, was reckoned as the *First Book*, which would again confirm what I said before to reconcile *Eusebius*, who reckons Nine *Books* of this *Phoenician* History with *Porphyry*, who reckons only Eight, that this *First Book* was taken into the Number of the *whole Work* by *Eusebius*, but left out by *Porphyry*, because it had a *distinct Title* by it self. Unless possibly the same passage in the *First Book* of the *Phoenician* History, were quoted by *Philo* in that other work of

(*) Thus it appears from the abrupt beginnings of many of *Philo*'s Works, that they were designed to continue others, though of *different Titles*. So St. *Lukes* Πρῶτον λόγον was his *Gospel*, his *Second* is Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, written, no doubt at the same time, and intended to continue the same History where his *Gospel* left it. So *Josephus* after his *Antiquities*, immediately subjoyned his *Life* (as has already been observed by the most Learned Dr. *Isaac Vossius*) and after his *Life* his Books against *Appion*, yet so as that his *Life* and his Two Books against *Appion* kept their distinct Titles, none ever mentioning any more than Twenty Books of his *Antiquities*, excepting *Cassiodore*, who reckons Two and Twenty, *Div. Lect. c.* 17. No doubt the Two odd Books were those against *Appion*. So that it seems his *Life*, though added as an *Appendix* to his Twentieth Book, yet did not encrease the Number. So *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s Third

of his concerning the *Jews*, for I confess there is some difficulty in making them the same. However, for the present, supposing that he designed one *Book* principally to give an acount of *Jewish* Affairs; and that he had withal, a farther design of arrogating the principal ornaments of their Nation to his own (of which his other Work is alone sufficient to render him suspicious, though he had no particular Book of this that bore such a Title) and that he knew that an account from *Phœnician* Records here, would not be taken for sufficient to confront their own so much *better*, and more *Authentick* Testimonies concerning themselves, especially when confirmed with such a concurrence of Testimonies of other Nations, *Phœnicians* as well as others, as he had seen produced by *Josephus*: Book *Ad Autolyc.* was not Antiently called the Third Book as it is now, but by a proper Title, *Liber de Temporibus ad Autolyc.* as appears from *Lactantius*, *Div. Inst.* l. 23. and it plainly begins with a new address, as if designing a new Argument. So *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Protreptick*, *Pædagogus* and *Stramateis* carry on the same design. So *Eusebius*'s Book *De Martyribus Palæstinæ* plainly connects with the end of the *Eighth Book* of his *Ecclesiastical History*, yet so as not to disturb the account of his *Ten Books* of that whole work. So the same *Eusebius*'s Three Books against *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and Two *De Ecclesiastica Theologia* belong plainly to the same work. So the Seven Books of *Lactantius* of *Divine Institutions*, have every one of them distinct *Titles*. But the instance of the Books of *Lucifer Calaritanus* is most remarkable. They were all designed as parts of the same work, written continuedly, and intended to be presented at the same time to the Emperour *Constantius*. Yet no continuation of any one *number* of *Books*, or *Title*. There are Two in defence of *Athanasius*, one *De Regibus Apostaticis*, another *De non conveniendo cum Hæreticis*, another *De non*

There-

parcendo in Deum delinquentibus, and lastly one *De eo quod moriendum sit pro Dei filio.* I have been the more particular in these instances, because as the Observations are useful, so I have not found them commonly taken notice of.

Therefore it may be, he thought it fit his *Sanchoniathon* should live in the time of *Abibalus* the Father of that *Hiram*, whose time was the highest Period of any *Phœnician* Testimonies, yet produced concerning *Jewish* Affairs.

§. XXXVII. THIS time he makes either *equal*, or a little *before* the Destruction of *Troy*, when he makes his Author equal to *Semiramis*, who was, as he tells us, either *equal*, or a little *before* that *War*. Which yet is not so to be understood, as if he had fixed this time by the Age of *Semiramis*. No, he would have his *Abibalus* equal with her, whose Husband *Ninus* was taken, as I said, for the utmost Period of *Heathen* History. But the fixation of this time, was from the time of *Abibalus*, and that *Abibalus* no other than the Father of *Hiram*. His time indeed, according to the account that had already been given from the *Tyrian* Records by *Menander Ephesius*, will agree with what is said concerning the War of *Troy*. For from the Twelfth of *Hiram*, concurrent with the Fourth of *Solomon* wherein the *Temple* was begun, to the building of

Carthage

Carthage by *Dido* are reckoned One Hundred forty three years and Eight Months, by *Josephus* from *Menander*. If therefore *Dido* received *Æneas* coming from *Troy*, as *Virgil* and his Authors will have it (as undoubtedly so exact a Man as he had *Authors* for what he said, and there is nothing so certainly agreed among Authors concerning the building either of *Carthage* or *Rome* to contradict it) *Sanchoniathon* must then have been so much and more (as contemporary, not with *Hiram*, but *Abibalus*) before the War of *Troy*, as *Porphyry* himself does expressly place him. Which there would yet have been more pretence for with them who had followed the account of *Appian*, who makes the very building of *Carthage* to have been Fifty years Elder than the Destruction of *Troy*. I doubt not but it was a great mistake, but I am only concerned to shew what account, right or wrong, they might have followed who made him Elder than the War of *Troy*. But if this same number of One hundred forty three years and Eight Months was the distance between the War of

Joseph. c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1042. B. 1043. F. & apud *Eus.* Pr.Ev. X.13. From whom *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s account of that same Number from the same Authority is to be corrected L. ii. *ad Autolyc.* cxliii. for cxxxiv. And *Lactantius* who usually followed *Theophilus* in his *Chronology* has cxl. neglecting the smaller number. *Div. Inst.* iv.8.

Οἱ δὲ τύπων χρόνοι καὶ περὶ τὴν Τρωϊκῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων. *Porph.* ap. *Eus.* Pr.Ev. l.9. p.31. D.

Appian. Punic. init.

Chron. L. ii. Num. *Euseb.* 971.

of *Troy* and the building of *Carthage*, as *Eusebius* does conceive; then it will follow that he was about the time of that *War*. And to this exactly agrees the account of the same *Menander* and *Lætus*, (the *Publisher* and *Translator* of *Mochus*, *Hypsicrates* and *Theodotus*) who make *Menelaus* put in at *Phœnicia* in his return from *Troy* in the time of *Hiram*. This I take to be the true account of this doubtful dis-junction concerning this time, because it is so very agreeable with the then extant *Phœnician* Authors. As for the making *Sanchoniathon* equal with *Semiramis*, as it was indeed done very unskilfully; so it seems (as I said) to have been with a design to put him beyond all possibility of conviction by different Authors, making him hereby so far *superior* in time to any *Records* that might pretend to rival him, as that he must have been *equal* to the *utmost* Period of time, that they pretended with any confidence to give any account of.

Menander & Lætus ap. *Cl. Alex.* Strom. 1. p. 326.

§. XXXVIII. AND having placed him thus high, he was in course obliged to derive his *Means* of *Information* yet *higher*. But being to give an account of *Jewish* Affairs, upon the Credit (as I said) of *Jewish* Testimonies, yet very different from

from those which were owned and received among the *Jews* themselves; he was therefore obliged to bethink himself of some *Jewish* Name to Father his Records upon, of whose *Writings* the *Jews* themselves had never heard. And the reasons, why he was to make him a *Priest*, might be of two sorts: That he might hereby recommend his Authors *Credit*, because those most Antient accounts of things were generally, as we have seen, derived from *Sacred Inscriptions* in *Temples* pretended also to have been written either in *Hieroglyphicks*, or *Sacred Characters*, to which as the *Priests* were supposed to have the easiest access, so they were also, by those *Mystical Instructions* which they were obliged to know as *Priests*, best qualified for understanding them: And that he might also give an account why such *unheard-of* Writings might have been so long concealed from *Vulgar* knowledge, because being *Sacred*, and written by a *Sacred Person*, they might have been kept within the *Adyta*, only amongst the *Priests*, which might also give an account how they might afterwards *miscarry*, before the pretended *Sanchoniathon* was to appear to quote them, though they might have been supposed really extant when he

he was to *Collect* his Obſervations from them. Accordingly, whoever of the *Philoſophers*, made it his buſineſs to enquire into the *Monuments* of any place, whether *Hiſtorical*, or *Philoſophical*, made his addreſſes to the *Prieſts* of the place, whoſe *Antiquities* he was deſirous to learn. So *Pythagoras* in *Phœnicia* to the *Prophets*, the Poſterity of *Mochus*, in *Ægypt* to the *Heliopolitane*, *Memphitane* and *Dioſpolitane Prieſts*, particularly to *Oennuphis* or *Pſenuphis*, and perhaps *Sonchis*; *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, but particularly *Solon*, to the ſame *Prieſts* now mentioned; *Eudoxus* to *Chonuphis*, and *Plato* to *Sechnuphis*. And for *Plato*, on occaſion of his *Story* of the Iſland *Atlantis*, and the Exploits of his own Country-men the *Athenians* againſt them, for which he was beholden, not to any *Athenian* Monuments, but only to thoſe pretended to by the *Ægyptian Saitane Prieſts*: So he thought himſelf concerned, as well as he could, to defend their *Credit*, and to do it by theſe degrees. Firſt, though this was only a matter of *Secular Hiſtory*, yet for the better recommendation of it, he refers, not to *Secular*, but *Sacred Records*. Next he aſſigns theſe *Sacred Writings*, as was undoubtedly moſt proper, to the cuſtody

Jamblich. de vit. *Pythagor.* *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* *Plutarch.* *Solon* & de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid.* *Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 303.

In *Tim.* init.

custody of the *Priests*. Then he insinuates a Recommendation of the *Credit* of their *Priests*, beyond any of other places that might be opposed to them, from the particular conveniences they enjoyed, above others, for addicting themselves wholly to the employment of their own Profession, and their unmixedness with the Prophane Vulgar. Accordingly they who, before *Sanchoniathon*, pretended to Publish their own Records, were generally *Priests*. So was *Berosus* and *Manetho*, and *Chæremon*. And *Manetho* assumes the Title in the very *Dedication* of his Work, as if it were purposely to add the greater credit to his performance. And though the *Jews* pretended to no such *Sacred Pillars* or *Inscriptions*; nor ever kept their *Sacred Books* so reserved from the *Vulgar*, either in *Sacred* unknown *Characters*, or by laying them up in the *Adyta*; yet because it was fashionable, they also insisted on the same way of defending their own *Records* against the *Heathens* who contradicted them. So *Josephus* also reasons. He also derives his *Information* from the *Sacred Records* of his own *Nation*. He makes the *preserving* these *Records* the peculiar Province of their *Priests*. He insists on the same *Qualifications*

Ap. *Euseb.* Chr. Gr. p. 6.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036.

lifications of their *Priests*, which *Plato* had used before him, their *Separation* from *Secular* Employments, and their *unmixedness* with Vulgar *Affinities*. And as often as he has occasion to vindicate his *own Credit*, either against *Justus Tiberiensis*, or the then *Gentile* Authors who had given other accounts of the *Jewish War*, than he had done, though this were not a Subject wherein he could pretend any *Sacred Records*, yet still he insists on this Topick of his being a *Priest* for Vindicating his own *Historical Credit* against them. So that from hence the Learned *Bochart* might have seen a very useful reason why *Sanchoniathon*, when he makes his *Hieromba*al not only a *Jew*, but a *Priest*, should also understand the name *Priest* in the *Sacred* and *Popular* signification.

Antiq. xvi. 11. p. 563. E. cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1038. A.

§. XXXIX. AND having thus made him a *Jew* and a *Priest*, it followed farther, that he was to be made a *Priest* of the *God* of the *Jews*. But *Jao* (which is the same name with *Jevo*, and is read for it in this same passage of *Porphyry* concerning *Sanchoniathon*, as we have it in *Theodoret*) is the name by which the *God* of the *Jews* was known among the *Heathens*, even before the time of *Philo Biblyus*. *Diodorus Siculus* in the time of *Augustus*, had expresly

Theodoret. Therap. ii.

Biblio-thec. L. ii.

expresly made *Jao* to be the *God* from whom *Moses*, as he would have it believed, *pretended* to have received his *Laws*. And it may also hence be conjectured why he pitched on *Gideon* rather than any other on whom he was to Father his Forgeries. He designedly chooses to call him by his *Sir-name* of *Hierombaal*, rather than his *Original* name of *Gideon*, possibly because it was the Fashion, as on other occasions, so on the undertaking the Office of a *Priest*, for those *Orientals*, to *change* their *names*, as one Ceremony of their *Consecration*. Thus *Joseph*, whom they made a Ἱερογραμματεὺς, had the *Ægyptian name* given him of *Psonthom-phanech* in the Scripture, but *Peteseph* in *Chæremon*; *Moses* that of *Osarsiph* in *Manetho* *Tisithen* in *Chæremon*, *Joachim*, but especially *Melchi* with the *Mystæ* in *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And this might also have been the reason why *Nebuchadnezzar* changed the *names* of *Daniel* and the *Three Children* when he had given them up to the Institution of the *Chaldæans* who were reputed Sacred among them. And upon this account, as I said, he might the

Chæremon ap. *Joseph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B.

Osarsiph ap. *Maneth. Jos.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1054. A *Tisithen* ap. *Chæremon. Joseph.* ib. p. 1057. B.

Joachim and *Melchi* after his Assumption into Heaven. *Clem. Alexandr.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C.

rather make a *Priest* of *Gideon*, because there is none of the *Judges* but he that has any more than one name given him in the Scripture. But insisting on his Authority as a *Priest*, he might think it more convenient to call him by his *Mystical Name*, rather than by that by which he was commonly known. Besides, who knows but he might purposely pitch upon the name Ἱερεμβαὰλ that the very name might seem to the *Greeks* (for whom he designed his pretended Translation) to imply his being a Ἱερεὺς? There are innumerable Examples of the like absurd Etymologies of Words of other Tongues, especially among *Mystical* Writers of all sorts, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, from *Greek Originals*, which yet generally prevailed. How much more easie was it for him to impose on them in a Tongue so little understood by them as the *Hebrew* or *Punick*? They themselves took a Liberty of doing it, when they had a mind to prove their own *Fictions* from such ignorant *Etymologies*. Thus *Lysimachus* proved that the *Jews* had built their City *Hierusalem*, with the *Sacrilegious* spoils of all other *Temples* and *Altars* they met with in their way from the *Etymo-*

Lysimach. ap. *Joseph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1058. G. So *Eupolemus* derives *Hierosolyma* quasi ἱερὸν Σολομῶνος, ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. ix.

Etymology of *Hierosolyma quasi* ἱερόσυλα. Who knows also but he might himself gather a thing he was so willing should prove true from the very *Hebrew* name of *Gideon*? It may be he might think it to have some affinity with the ירעו rendred by the LXXII. ἐπωιδοὶ and περαπολάται, which none can doubt to have been proper to the *Superstitious Priest-hoods* of those times, of which kind it is most likely this Heathen would make that of *Gideons*. As for the Letter G, where it stands for ע, there it is frequently neglected, and even where it stands for ר, as it does here, yet it is easily changed for another Letter of the same *Organ*, as ' is. But, if we must needs take in the ר, yet he might possibly collect the same from ירע the root of גרעון. If it signifie to *destroy*, we know the *Sacrifices* were *Symbols* of *destruction*, either as acknowledged due for past crimes, or as imprecated in case of any new violation of *Faith* for the future, as in those which were used in the making of *Covenants*. Accordingly the word διχοτομεῖν is used for *destruction*, no doubt in allusion to the ἐντόμια which were cut into *two pieces* for the *Covenanters* to pass through. But if it signifie to divide, that is yet most properly the *Priests* Office,

Vid. *Selden* de Diis *Syr.* Syntagm. 1. c. 2. & *Buxtorf.*

St. *Matth.* xxiv. 51.

Office, whence the Notion of ὀρθοτομεῖν τὸν λόγον in the Apostle, applyed to *Sacrifices* *Gen.* iv. 7. in the LXXII. Whether by dividing we understand the dividing the whole for the Parties to pass through, or the dividing the back (whence the Notion of πεπραγματευμένα in the Apostle) to look into the Entrails, or the dividing the Fat to Gods part to be burnt, not reserving it to themselves, of which the famous Story of *Prometheus* among the *Heathens*, which is supposed most properly to belong to the Case of *Cain*.

Ap. *Hesiod.* Theogon.

§. XL. It was also further usual in those Precedents, whom our pretended Author seems to emulate in Forging this work, to begin their *Antiquities* with a Philosophical Κοσμογονία. So had *Moses*, whose Translation by the LXXII. very probably first set the rest upon it. So had *Berosus*, as appears by what we have from *Alexander Polyhistor* out of his First Book. So *Manetho*'s in his Book *Sothis*, the same it should seem with his ἱερὰ βίβλος, in which was contained his *Theologia*, another name of the Mystical accounts of those First *Originals*, and it may be the same with the Φυσιολογικὰ mentioned by *Suidas*, and seems to have been also the beginning of his History. Thus therefore *Philo* also thought

In *Euseb.* Gr. p. 6. In *Euseb.* Gr. p. 6. & de Pr. Ev. II. p. 44. C.

Voce Μανεθῶν.

thought it convenient to begin his *Sanchoniathon* with a Philosophical, but Mystical account of the beginning of the World. And here also the *Ægyptian* Notions had generally obtained. I have shewn how *Berosus* and the *Phœnicians* came to pretend to them. I have also shewn how the Doctrine even of *Moses* came to be taken into them. But it seems to have been the custom of the *Ægyptians*, to father all their Arts and Monuments, and Sacred Constitutions on *Hermes*. Thence so many thousand Books ascribed to him in *Jamblichus*. Nor was it only taken up by them. It was usual in those times to father the Monuments of a Sect on the first Author of it. Thus the *Golden Verses*, and other works among the *Pythagoreans* ascribed to *Pythagoras*, who yet is said to have written (*) nothing, and that with a design that his Disciples might not read, but live according to his Injunctions. Thus *Plato*'s Discourses fathered on *Socrates* who yet disowned (*) his being the Author of many things there attributed to him. Thus (*) *Zoroastres*'s works kept secret among

De Myst. *Ægypt.* & *Chald.*

* *Josph.* c. *Appion.* L. I. 1046. E. *Lucian* de lapsf. in salut. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Rufin.* *Plutarch.* de Fort. *Alexand.* L. I. p. 328. A. *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* p. 208. *Claudian. Mam.* de Stat. Anim. L. II. c. 3. (*) *Laert.* L. III. Platon. p. 78. B. The same *Athenæus* says concerning *Gorgias* and *Phædon* Deipnos. L. xi. c. 15. p. 505. 2. 507. B. (*) *Clem. Al.* Str. I. p. 304. D.

mong the Disciples of *Prodicus*, a shrewd suspicion of their being Forged by them. And this modish way of those times was, in all likelihood, the occasion of so many Supposititious Works Forged by the Primitive Hereticks under the name of the *Apostles*. So also (*) *Enoch* being owned by the *Babylonians* for the Author of *Judicial Astrology*, and other Arts and Sciences, being pretended to have been revealed to his Son *Mathuselah* by an *Angel*, was in all likelihood the occasion of Forging the Prophecy of *Enoch*, and those Discoveries pretended in it by the Ἐγρήγοροι though it also appears that the Books of *Mercury* favoured the same accounts of the fall of those Angels, because the *Babylonians* and *Ægyptians* both pretended to the same Traditions at *Heliopolis*. But in no sort of Writing was this more frequent than in their (1) *Dialogues*, which was the Form generally observed in these pretended Works of *Mercury*. And I cannot tell, but these same Traditions of the *Heliopolitanes* were so far countenanced by the *Jews* themselves, as their own Revealed Religion would give leave. The account of *Moses*'s Expedition into *Æthiopia*, and several other things much for his advantage, was taken by

(*) *Eupolem.* ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Fragm. ap. *Stob.* Eclog. Phys. & *Lactant.* Div. Inst. ii. 15, 16.

(1) Expressly owned by *Cicero* Ep. ad *Varron.* ante Quæs. Academ. & *Macrob.* Saturnal. L. 1. c. 1.

by *Artapanus* from the *Heliopolitanes*, and greedily followed by *Josephus*, which shews no ill understanding among them. So also does the *Jews* choosing that place above all others, to build their *Ægyptian* Temple of *Onias*, I mean at the *Heliopolitane Leontopolis* in contradistinction to *Leontopolis*, that was the head of a distinct νομὸς. Nor is there any heed to be taken of the *Rabbins* who place it in *Alexandria*, though I believe, by *Alexandria* they mean the whole *Ægyptian* Colony of *Jews*, in opposition to their Colonies in other Countries.

Artapan. apud *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27. p. 432. D. *Joseph.* Aut. ii. 5.

Joseph. Ant. xii. 15. xiii. 6. xx. 8. Bell. Jud. vii. 30.

Vid. *Selden* de Success. in Pontif. Heb. L. ii. c. 8.

XLI. THIS *Ægyptian Philosopher* therefore, being that which was ingredient in most of the received Κοσμογονίαι, at least being pretended and conceived to be so, how different soever the accounts were, which were pretended from that same Original; therefore *Philo Byblius* also thought it fit to take it into his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. And because he had found it Fathered on Authors who so little agreed concerning the Particulars of it, where it was to be had, and who must therefore some of them be certainly mistaken; it was therefore necessary to pre-

tend to ſome very *certain means* of *Information*. Accordingly he alſo pretends to the *Writings*, not the Pillars of *Taautus* or *Mercury*. Which, by the way, makes it ſuſpicious that he took his Informations from the Books as Publiſhed from the *Heliopolitane* Pillars, ſeeing he does not himſelf, ſo much as pretend to the Original Pillars themſelves; and yet to ſecure his Credit from being only at the *Second hand*, he pretends that *Mercury* cauſed them to be written Originally, not in Pillars, but in Books. But becauſe ſo many before him who had pretended to thoſe ſame *Writings*, had yet miſtaken in *Interpreting* them; he therefore contrives a likely account how they might have a likely occaſion of ſuch miſtakes, and yet himſelf be free from the Suſpicion of the like *Errors*. He pretends therefore that the firſt *Writings* of *Mercury*, had extricated the *Philoſophical* accounts of the firſt *Originals* of things, from the *Mythological* Arts of concealment, wherein *Antiquity* had involved them; and that it was ſome while after, but yet before any communication with the *Greeks*, that the Prieſts had again involved them. Which yet being done before *Orpheus*'s time, by whoſe means they came to the *Greeks*, was a plain occaſion

occasion how the *Greek* Writers, who followed those latter accounts darkened purposely by the Priests, might be mistaken. Because they had nothing to inform them but these designedly obscure *Allegories*, which were both capable of many senses in themselves; and if any certain sense had been preserved, yet it had not been easily discoverable by the *Greeks* without the Priests, who, as I said, were not forward to communicate any thing of that nature to *Strangers*.

§. XLII. AND by the same means he had also provided an account how the *Ægyptians* themselves might be mistaken concerning their own Philosophy. For those Priests, who first involved them, are said to have delivered them down thus obscured, both to their own *Successors*, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτελέσαι, that is, *to such as were initiated* in their *Mysteries*, as I believe *Vigerus* has rightly rendred it. It seems then, that they must not have been supposed to have cleared them, even to such as were *initiated*, which sure they would have done, if themselves had preserved any certain Tradition concerning them. Accordingly they are supposed to have continued under this obscurity, till (after many Generations from *Taautus*) *Surmu-*

Ap. *Euseb.* Pr.Ev.i. x. p. 39. C.

Ib.p.40.B.

Surmubelus and *Thuro* are said to have again unriddled them. So I understand those words of *Philo Byblius*; ἀλληγορίας ἐπεσκιασμένην τὴν Θεολογίαν ἐφώπσαν. For this seems to have been the Notion of that Sacred term φωπεμὸς, as it is used in the counterfeit Writings of *Mercury* (whom this Author follows) and the Pen-men of the *New-Testament*, and other such Writers of that Age, for the *Revelation* of *Mysteries*. I suppose from that Literal διδαχὴ and φωπεμὸς, and withdrawing of the *Vail* before the Shrine of the Image by the Ἱεροφάντης, which were in the ordinary course of *Initiation* to be used to those who were brought into the dark *Adyta*, and initiated in the higher sort of *Initiation* called Ἐποπτεία. These therefore I suspect to have been pretended for the Authors of the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνίων γράμματα, to which this Author pretended, as has already been observed. Wherein if I be not mistaken, it will than be further suspicious, that these Authors themselves did not so discover them as to make them common to the prophane *Vulgar*, but only so as to retrieve the *Traditions* of the *Priests*, which had probably, by that time, quite miscarried, after they had been so long reserved in their *Breasts*, and intrusted only

to

to *Oral-Tradition.* For, if these discoveries had been designed for the *Vulgar*, the *Writings* which contained them, would not have been styled Ἀπόκρυφα, (the proper term for *Mystical Writings*) nor confined to the Ἄδυτα, and by that means rendred inaccessible to *uninitiated Persons*, as they are supposed to have been. Besides that, by the present extant Epistle of *Ammon*, it appears that the *Ammonians* must not have been for divulging their *Mysteries*.

§. XLIII. AND in giving this account how all that had before him, written on this Subject, might have been mistaken, he at the same time secured his own Authority from the like Exceptions. For having pretended before, that *Taautus* had written his Books clear from those *Mythologies* and *Allegories* wherein they had been involved by the *Priests*, and were afterwards again involved till they were a second time unriddled by *Surmubelus* and *Thuro*; and having made his *Sanchoniathon* derive his Information immediately, both from *Taautu*'s own Books, and from the Books of those *Expositors*, who afterwards retrieved his way of speaking clearly without *Allegories*: He had hereby secured himself of two things

of

of great moment for recommending his *Credit*. One was, that his *Informations* were derived from clear and unobscured *Originals*, not from *Allegorical* and Second-hand accounts, from them who had no mind to be understood by those to whom they communicated their *Mysteries*. Another was that, even for those *Originals* themselves, he did not depend on a single Authority. The consent of the *Writings* of *Mercury*, with those of the *Ammonians*, were to be mutual attestations of the *Sincerity* of each (at least would be pleaded as such by him) that neither the Original Writings of *Taautus*, nor those retrievements from the *Ammonians*, might seem suspitious of being the Fictions of those who *first* produced them. For having pretended them to be from distant *Writers*, and distant places, and *Sacred* inaccessible *Records*; it would be pretended that there could not have been that *Communication* between them, as to make them able to agree in Forgeries. Yet was not this excluding of *Allegories* to be understood so, as if he had avoided all *Fables*; but particularly with respect to the *Stoical* way, whether by them derived to the later *Ægyptians*, or borrowed from them. That was to *Allegorize*

orize their first Histories into a Κοσμογνία, a Systeme of *Natural Philosophy*, to make *Jupiter* signifie the *Æther*, *Juno* the *Air*, *Vesta* the *Earth*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, *&c.* and so to *Allegorize* the History of the *Actions* of those *Persons* into a History of *Nature*, as if indeed there had never been such *Actions* or *Persons*, but only that the several *Elements* of *Nature* had been *Mystically* represented by such *Names*, and the *Phænomena* of *Nature* had, by a *Poetical Prosopopœia*, been turned into a *Romance*. That these were indeed the *Allegories* designed by *Philo Byblius*, appears by these words of his: Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτατοι τῶν ἱερολόγων, τὰ μὲν γεγονότα πράγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, ἀλληγορίας καὶ μύθους ὑπονοήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι, μυστήρια κατέστησαν, καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον πύρον ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως πρὰς συνορᾶν τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενα. And again, Ἀλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἐναμίξας, *&c.* And what with graceful mixtures of *Poetical fancy*, in the most Antient *Writers* of their *First Originals*, who were generally *Poets*; what with that delight of the *Antients* in *Parables*, and in vesting their *Parables* with *Historical* and likely *Circumstances*; what with that ordinary Method of these *Mystical Writers*, who usually made way for their *Allegories*,

Philo Bybl. ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 9.

Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. x. p 39. C.

Allegories by catching at little occasions of confuting the *Historical Truth* of what they designed to *Allegorize* (wherein we see them imitated by *Philo*, *Origen*, and the other *Antients* who first began to practice this way with the *Scriptures*) I say with all these ways, they made it indeed seem likely, if not concerning all that was said of those *Persons*, yet concerning many of them, that they were not so much as designed for Historical Truths, but only for *Allegorical Representation*. Yet these not being distinguishable from their designed Histories, at least not in later times after the obliteration of the *Original Traditions*; and being withal delivered on the same *Authority* which delivered the designed Histories; must therefore render all their Histories liable to just Suspicion.

§. XLIV. NOR does it seem to have been the way of *Allegorizing* only, that *Philo* found fault with in the *Greek* Writers, and that uncertainty of their Histories which necessarily followed thereupon; but also the indecorousness of their *Allegories* to their *Deities*, which the *Epicureans* and *Jews* before, but now in *Philo*'s time, the *Christians* had lately made great advantage of, for exposing the

the received Religions. When he makes *Anobret* (designed the same with *Sarah*) an ἐπῳδὸν νύμφη. The very name of *Nymph* is *Allegorical*, and in the *Philosophical Allegories*, of a peculiar signification. This therefore *Philo* takes particular notice of, that from these *Allegories* of the *Phœnician* Priests, the *Greeks* had taken occasion to set up those which were so very offensive, and gave so great advantage to their common Adversaries. Ἐνθεν Ἡσίοδος, ὅτι κυκλικοὶ πεπηγμένοι θεογονίας, καὶ γιγαντομαχίας, καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἔπλασαν ἰδίας καὶ ἀκτομὰς οἷς συμπειρεόμενοι, ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. These were the *Allegories* so much decryed, not only by *Adversaries*, but disowned by the *Philosophers* generally, and such generally as, with any judgment, undertook the defence of the received Religions: That the *Gods* should have a beginning, and be *Born* by the Conjunction of *Males* and *Females* like other *Mortals*, (this he means by their Θεογονίαι) That they should be molested by *Wars*, and reduced to so great *extremities*, as the Fablers pretended, in the Wars with the *Giants*, and *Typhon* and *Euceladus* and the *Titans* (those were the Γιγαντομαχίαι and Τιτανομαχίαι) That they should *Emasculate* one another as *Saturn* is pretended to have

Vid. *Porphyr.* de Antr. Nymphar.

Philo ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9.

have served *Ouranus*, and *Jupiter* his Father *Saturn* (those are the Ἐκτομαὶ here meant.) These the wisest Men looked on, not only as corruptions of their Histories, but as reproaches to their *Gods*, and Religions. *Plato* disowned them, and therefore sends *Homer* Crowned out of his Common-wealth. So did *Heraclides*, and generally the *Stoicks*, who for this very reason turned them into *Allegory*. So *Plutarch*, *Proclus* and *Macrobius*. And therefore here *Philo* thought he might do an acceptable piece of service to the common cause of *Philosophy* and *Paganism* in general, if he could from the *Originals* of these Fictions, shew that they were intended for no other but *Fictions*, by those who first invented them; and that they had no grounds in their First and most simple, and most creditable *Traditions* and *Histories*, but were super-added by those who neither did, nor could pretend to any new means of *Information*, and by this means disoblige their common cause, from the defence of what the common consent of their Wise men had granted, to be indeed so very indefensible.

De Allegor. *Homer*. *Plutarch*. de Audiend. Poet. de *Is.* & *Osirid.* p. 355. 358. Procl. Theol. Plat. Lib. 1. c. 4. *Macrob.* Somn. Scip. L. 1. c. 2.

§. XLV. HE pretends therefore, in his own *History*, to give us, from the forementioned

mentioned Records, the Historical Truth concerning those Antient *Persons* and *Actions* of the *Phœnicians*, free from those Additional passages concerning them, which were only invented for designs of *Allegory*, whether by the *Greeks*, or the *Phœnician* Priests themselves. Yet neither so does his performance agree with his undertaking. However it comes to pass (whether through the *heedlessness* of *Philo*, or his *Injudiciousness* in his choice out of extant Histories, what he was to Father on his *Sanchoniathon*) we have some things intermixed, which neither are likely to have been true, nor to have been designed for such by the Authors; nay seem to have been designed for no other than *Allegorical* Senses, and that in the worst most indefensible way of *Allegorizing*, from which he had pretended to vindicate their received Religion. He makes his *Saturn Emasculate* his Father *Ouranus*. Here is one of the Ἐπιμαι which he had before reckoned among the most *Scandalous* sort of *Allegories*. But this he may possibly pretend to have been done by his *Man Saturn*, who was afterwards by mistake made a *God*, especially as the name *God* implyed not a *Divine* Honour only, but also a *Divine Nature*. And con-

 cerning

cerning the *Men* it might have been Historically true, and designed for no more by his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. But what shall we say to that which follows, where he makes the Blood that flowed from the Wound of *Ouranus* to have *passed into the Springs and Rivers?* What? one Man's Blood, and from such a Wound as that was, to have flowed into the *Fountains* and *Rivers?* Certainly this could have been meant for no other but an *Allegory*. It is like what is told concerning *Osiris* among the *Ægyptians*, and the Tears of *Sophia* among the *Valentinians*, who seem to have borrowed much of their *Heresie* from the *Ægyptians*, where it first appeared. And I can hardly doubt, but that this was intended by the *Authors* from whom he took it, to shew the true *Original* of *Fountains* and *Rivers*, that the *Waters beneath the Firmament*, as the Scripture distinguishes them, were derived from those *above the Firmament*; the *Fountains of the Deep* supplied from the *Windows of Heaven*; the *Fountains* and the *Rivers* nourished by the *Rain* which came from Οὐρανὸς, in the larger Notion of it, as it includes the *Air* also. And possibly considering this as taken from *Taautus* an *Ægyptian*, by the *Rivers* might be meant the

Ἀπέφηνεν αὐτῷ τὸ αἷμα τῶν αἰδοίων εἰς τὰς πηγὰς, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν τὰ ὕδατα. ap. *Euseb.* Ib. p. 38. B.

the several *Ostia* and *Cuts* of *Nilus*, from which no doubt all the *Fountains* of *Ægypt* proceeded, which were accordingly turned also into *Blood*, when *Nilus* was so; and then he might allude to the Tradition of the *Ægyptians*, that *Nilus* was derived from *Heaven*, as *Diodorus* tells us.

So *Homer* calls it Διϊπετὴς.

Πεὶν γ' ἢ τ' ἐν Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ὀδυσσ. Δ.
Αὖτις ὕδωρ ἐλθῃ. ———

And again.

Αὖ δ' εἰς Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ib.
Ἐπῆσα νέεσθαι.

Αἴγυπτος with him is *Nilus*. And I am apt to think that the reason why he called it Διϊπετὴς, was because of all those many Opinions which were afterwards raised concerning the Rise of *Nilus*, he rather inclined to that which derived it from the *Air* which is called *Jupiter* and Οὐρανὸς, as I said in the larger Sense, whether from the *Rain* or the melted *Snow*, both of which belong to *Jupiter* in the sense now mentioned. The most *Antient* and most *Popular* Opinions are most likely to have been intended by the *Mythologers*. And to prove that this was so, we cannot have a fitter Testimony than this of *Homer*. He is one of the most *Antient* of the *Pagan* Writers. As a *Poet*, he is most suited to *Vulgar* capacity, and of nearest affinity to the *Mythologists*. He was an *Ægyptian* Born, of

the *Ægyptian Thebes*, if we may believe *Heliodorus*. But whether we believe him or not, yet it is more unanimously agreed, that he learned most of his Philosophical Notions from the *Ægyptians*. Whence it will follow, that this was most probably the *Popular* received opinion among the *Ægyptians* in the time of *Homer*. And of the Two Opinions (which as I said, do make for this purpose) one of them was received by most of the *Greatest* and most *Antient* even among the *Ægyptians* themselves. That the *Nilus* had its Original from *Rain*, was the Opinion of (1) *Aristotle*, (2) *Agatharchides*, and of the *Ægyptian Priests*, as (3) *Eudoxus* assures us. That it was from *Snow* was the sense of (4) *Democritus*, (5) *Anaxagoras*, (6) *Æschylus*, (7) *Sophocles*, (8) *Euripides*, and all (9) *Antiquity*, mentioned also by (10) *Lucretius* and (11) *Mela*, whether soever of the two be true, or was thought so by the *Antient Ægyptians*, or by the most *Antient Philosophers* (who in all likelihood borrowed what they said concerning it from the *Ægyptians*) is equally subservient, to shew what might have been the actual sense of the pretended *Hermes* in this *Allegory*.

(1) *Aristotle*, Anonym. ap. Phot. Cod. cxlix.
(2) *Agatharchides*. Diodor. *Sicul*. Bibl. L. 1. *Theoph. Simocatta* ap. *Phot*. Cod. LXV.
(3) Ap. *Plutarch*. de Plac. Philos. L. iv. c. 1.
(4 5) *Diodor. Sic*. Bib. L. 1
(6 7 8 9) *Senec*. Nat. Quæst. iv. 2.
(10) *Lucret*. L. vi.
(11) *Mela*. l. 9.
Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. 1.

logery. And that *Nilus* is derived from the Blood of the *Genitals* of *Ouranus*, rather than any other part, might have been to express the *Fruitfulness* of this *River* above all others. The *Slime* it brought along with it, manured the Land for *Corn*, and was withal so very *Prolifick*, as that it engendred several *Animals*, and made *Women* Fruitful that used the Water, and gave occasion to the Fancy of those Antient *Atheists*, who thought the first Men produced out of the *Slime* of *Nilus*. Now if I have hit the meaning right in this instance, this will also afford a new Argument against our pretended *Sanchoniathon*. Either he pretended falsly that *Taautus* was free from these *Physiological Allegories*, especially from the *Scandalous* sort of them, and this was a mistake that must needs have been *willful*, and with ill *design*. He must needs have known from the Books themselves, if he had indeed any such Books, whether any such matter was so much as pretended by him. If it was *pretended*, but *falsly*; that will ruine the Credit of *Taautus* himself, and make him suspicious of being forged by some Modern concerned Author, which will consequently ruine the Credit of *Sanchoniathon* also, if he pretend to know Fictions invented so long after

his own time. Or else he did not *confine* himself to those Informations of *Taautus*, which were indeed free from such *Allegories*. And this will also be another conviction of his *Insincerity* in pretending what he did not intend to perform. In all likelihood it was *Philo* who here betrayed himself, and forgot the Person he was to Act under the name of *Sanchoniathon*. Which will be a conviction of his disingenuous dealing in this, as well as his other pretended means of *Information*.

§. XLVI. THIS seems to have been this Authors design in pretending to the now mentioned means of *Information*. If I might presume yet farther, to guess why he pitched on the very name of *Sanchoniathon*, on whom he was desirous to Father his Forgeries; I do not know whether it might not have been in imitation of the *Ægyptian Sonchis*, to whom *Solon* and *Pythagoras* are said to have been beholden for what discoveries were made to them of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*. He is stiled an Ἱερογραμματεὺς, and Ἀρχιερεὺς, one of the most Learned of their Priests of *Sais*; Characters excellently qualifying him for understanding their *Sacred Records*, those especially of his *Country-man* the *Ægyptian Mercury*. But yet because he was to make him as

Solon. *Plutarch.* in *Solon.* & de *Isid.* & *Osiride.* *Pythagoras* *Clem. Alex.* Strom. 1.

well

well as *Mercury*, pass for *Phœnicians*; therefore he might think it fit a little to disguise his name with a termination different from that whereby he was known to the *Alexandrians*, as he had done in the name of *Mercury*. He calls him designedly *Taautus*, whom he confesses that the *Ægyptians* called Θωθ, the *Alexandrians* Θωθ. Why might he not accordingly call him *Sanchoniathon*, whom the *Ægyptians* called *Sonchis*, especially if by such a change he could draw such an Argument for his credit from his very name, as *Bochart* conceives? This *Sonchis* had taught *Solon* the Ἀτλαντικὸς λόγος. This seems to have been no other than the Ἀτλαντίων θεολογία in *Diodorus Siculus*, and in all likelihood was the same with that of *Mercury*, as this of *Sanchoniathon* was professedly. For those *Atlantii* challenged *Mercury* for theirs, and made him the Son of *Maja* the Daughter of their famous *Astrological Atlas*, and it may be this was the reason why our pretended *Sanchoniathon* also thought fit to challenge *Atlas* as a *Phœnician*, that they might also have the double Title to that same *Philosophy*, on account of *Atlas* as well as of *Mercury*. I am apt to suspect that the occasion of this *Philosophy* of the *Atlantii* might have been taken from the men-

Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. iii. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. ii.

tion of the *Atlantick Island* in *Plato's Timæus*. This, some Author well known to *Diodorus*, might (in imitation of the *Philosophical Mythologies*, then so much in fashion, and particularly of *Euemerus* who wrote his *Sacred History* from a like pretended Memoirs of a fictious *Island* called *Panchaia*) have made the Subject of new Discoveries. He might have Personated some who had found it, and in describing the place and the People, it very well became the *Poem*, to have given an account of their Sentiments, on those Subjects concerning which that Age was so very inquisitive and curious. Yet it also became it to derive them from *Atlas*, and so to fit their Opinions to his Person. Or perhaps it might rather have been that yet more antient account of *Solon*, concerning the *Atlantes* in Verse, from whom *Plato* took his first occasion, but (as *Plutarch* tells us) never lived to finish it. It should seem the design of these *Atlantick* Discourses both of *Solon* and *Plato* was much larger than that small account given in *Plato's Timæus*. From some of these, rather than *Timæus*, it is probable that *Ælian* had his Tradition that the *Kings* of *Atlantes* that were of *Neptunes* race, wore their Diadems of *Hee-goats* as their *Queens* did of *Shee-goats* hairs. The Nation

Plutarch. Solon. p. 92, 96.

Ælian. de Animal. xv. 2.

Nation of the *Atlantes* are mentioned by the Antients as inhabiting at the foot of Mount *Atlas*, the Ὀκεανὸν ἀκτῶντα in *Ælian*, upon whom these Traditions were immediately Fathered. And the Country thereabouts, as it is described by the same *Ælian* probably from the same Traditions, was very pleasant and *Sacred*; and upon both accounts, very fit for the Scene of such a *Poetick Philosophy*. But though that might have been the *Poetick Scene*, yet the *Ægyptians* seem to have been the *Poets* that contrived these Stories, that we may not admire how it should agree with the Doctrine of *Mercury*. For as *Plato* had it from *Solon*, so *Solon* seems to have pretended it no higher than *Sonchis* the *Ægyptian*. And considering the *Antiquity* pretended of these *Atlantians*, no *Nation* could or did pretend to such *Information* concerning a Nation situate in the *West* of *Africa* as the *Ægyptians*. Besides *Enoch* was taken for the same with this famous *Astrological Atlas*, as *Eupolemus* tells us. How could they have taken up this conjecture, but from the agreement they had observed between the Doctrines of *Atlas*, and those of *Enoch*? How could they guess at the Doctrine of *Enoch*, but by the *Apocryphal Writings* then extant under his Name? The *Atlantick*

Herodot. Melpom. *Mela.* 14. 8. *Plin.* N. Hist. v. 13.

Ælian. Anim. vii. 2.

Eupolemus ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Doctrines

Doctrines therefore agreed with those of the *Book* of *Enoch*, and that those agreed also with the Forgeries then extant under the name of *Mercury*, has already been ob-
§. 40. served. So that *Sonchis* taught *Solon* nothing but what had very well become the Person of *Sanchoniathon*.

§. XLVII. THUS I have endeavoured to give an account of the design of this whole *Fiction*, and that such a one as might agree both with the *Time* and *Person* of *Philo Byblius*. I have shewn what liberty the *Principles* of those *Philosophers* allowed them for the Practice of such *disingenuities*. I have shewn how little such an Author as *Sanchoniathon* was known before the time of *Philo Byblius*, notwithstanding all the search that had been made into the *Phœnicians Records*, and how little *regarded* after. I have shewn how little he savoured of the Antient *simplicity*, and how much of the *Modern Emulations*. I have shewn how little creditable he is in his pretended means of *Information*, and how far from that singular *Love* of *Truth*, for which he would have it believed, that his *Sanchoniathon* was so particularly remarkable. I have shewn that those means themselves are also suspicious, either that they never were extant, as the *Memories* of *Gideon*; or that they were

Coun-

counterfeited themselves, as the *Writings of Taautus* and the *Ammonians*, and that long after the time that *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have lived in; that he could have followed no *Jewish Records* in his accounts of *Jewish* matters; and that his following the Writings of *Mercury* and the *Ammonians*, divulged so long after his pretended Age, are rather Convictions of his *Falsehood*, than a Recommendation of his *Credit*. I have endeavoured also, as far as I could guess from the *Circumstances* he lived in, to give a particular account of the *occasion* and *design* of each particular observed in the management of this whole *Fraud*. And I know not what can be desired more for the Conviction of it at this distance of time, and loss of *Original Monuments*.

§. XLVII. NOR can I see that this discovery will in the least injure the Cause for which those *Pious* as well as *Learned* Persons have been concerned, who have hitherto made use of this Author for *expounding* or *confirming* some *Historical* or *Philosophical* passages of *Scripture* If there were any of these *Heathen Antiquities*, that could either pretend to the *Age* of the *Scriptures*, or to that even *Domestick* Evidence of being *genuine*, there might then be some

pretence

pretence for reconciling or confirming some passages of the Scriptures by them for their use who did not grant the advantage of the *Sacred* Writers above their own in regard of their *Divine Inspiration*. But we never hear of any of those *Heathen* accounts of things mentioned in the Scriptures before the Translation of the LXXII put them into an *Emulation*. Then it was that *Berosus* and *Manetho*, and *Menander*, and *Letus* first made and published their Enquiries. No mention of the *Chaldean Xisuthrus*, nor of the *Ægyptian Hycsi*, nor of *Abraham* nor *Moses*, nor the *general Deluge* in *Ctesias* or *Xenophon*, or *Herodotus*, or any of those more Antient *certainly-genuine* Writers. When they did publish them, the very *Records* pretended for them make them suspicious of Forgery. They were pretended only from *Sacred Pillars* extant in *Adyta*, and these very *Pillars* challenged in several places, yet not accessible by any who had been desirous to convict them. But the Scriptures were only then *Translated*. The *Originals* were extant long before in *Books accessible* and intelligible by any who had the curiosity to learn their *Tongue*. I do not insist on the *Translation* pretended to have been in *Plato*'s time, because I find no better Arguments for it than

than guesses that *Plato* had some things from the Sacred Writings, which I believe he had not, besides that such a *Supposition* is directly contrary to the much better attested Story of *Aristæus* concerning the Translation performed by the command of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. I rather choose those more Antient instances of *Theopompus* the Historian, and *Theodectes* the Poet, who had seen and understood these Books of *Jews*, before the Translation of *Philadelphus*, as we are assured by *Demetrius Phalereus* in *Aristæus*, besides that even the Book of *Daniel*, one of the latest of them, was yet shewn to *Alexander* the *Great*, if we may believe *Josephus*. So that even from the *Greeks* we have as early Evidence of their being known, as we have of their being enquired after, or of their being in a capacity to understand them, and there can be no reason to expect earlier. Besides the repugnancy of those other Nations to each other, and of the different Authors even of the same Nation, were certain Arguments that they did not write from the same uniform and true *Records*, as the *Jews* who all agreed in the same Books, as *Josephus* observes. And for the *Pentateuch*, that of the *Samaritanes* must in all likely-

Ap. *Josep.* Ant. xii. 2.

Ant. xi. 8.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036. F.

hood

hood have been received from them before the the time of the LXXII. both because the *Samaritanes* were before that so exasperated by the *Jews*, as that it is not likely they would receive any such thing from them, and because it should seem the *Prophets* were not then collected by the *Jews* that they might have been delivered to them, and because they still preserve it in the *Old Hebrew* Character, not in that which was afterwards introduced by *Esdras*. Upon all these accounts it cannot be thought reasonable either to oppose these *Heathen* accounts to the Scriptures, or to think that any thing can be made more creditable in the Scriptures, because it is confirmed by the consent of so exceptionable Authorities. I have rather shewn that the occasion of their agreeing in *Philosophical* matters, was rather their imitating and allowing the Authority of *Moses*, and making him the Standard of their several κοσμογονίας. Which may indeed be of use for shewing Historically how that part of *Moses* was actually understood from those times wherein these Heathen accounts were first produced; but can be of no farther use for shewing either the sense of *Moses*, or how the anti-

ent

ent first Deliverers of his Doctrine did actually understand him, than as these things may be inferred, or presumed, from the actual sense of those later times, wherein these *Heathen Antiquities* first appeared.

F I N I S.
